

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCXLVII.

OCTOBER, 1885.

INHUMAN CRIMES IN ENGLAND.

THE revelations of the inhuman crimes perpetrated in England, made the other day by the "Pall Mall Gazette," have given a profound shock to the moral sense of our whole country, and, as we know from the journals and correspondence now daily coming back upon us from all parts of Europe and from the United States, to the whole world. All eyes are fixed on London as the modern Babylon, full of all manner of iniquities, and it may be that in foreign capitals many are resting in the belief that the atrocities of London exceed in degree, if not also in kind, the offenses of any other city.

It is unavoidable that, in a population of over four millions, our offenses should be greater, at least in multitude if not also in enormity, than the crimes of other and lesser centers of population. Nevertheless, it was only on Friday last, the 24th July, that I received from Boston a letter of ardent sympathy in the terrible work in which the "Pall Mall Gazette" is engaged, and invoking our help, when our labor at home is done, in a similar effort for the cleansing of Boston and New York.

The writer of the letter very truly says that the example and influence of London demoralizes the world, not only by reason of

its vastness, but also because it is, like Rome of old, the *certera gentium*—for the foul streams of all nations flow into it. There are quarters of London inhabited by aliens of all nations which for profligacy and all manner of evil are proverbial. I do not say this to throw off our own shame, which is too black and burning to be shifted from ourselves. I have no care to ask what revelations might easily be made in Paris, in Vienna, or in Naples. We are black enough, and guilty enough, in London to confine my thoughts to London alone.

You may wish to learn whether these enormities were not already known, and, if known, why they were not long ago exposed. The answer, I believe, is this: They were known as forms are seen in the dark. We were sure of their existence. Here and there terrible cases came before our courts or were dealt with in private. The state of our streets at night gradually awakened attention and caused remonstrance. The efforts to check these evils were partial and intermittent. The extent of the immoral world in the midst of us was altogether unrecognized; its organization and systematic purveying and its almost ubiquitous activity were not only not ascertained but not even suspected; and, when suspected, were treated as incredible. Excepting only those whose professions and duties brought them into immediate contact with the terrible realities of life, the greater part of the upper and governing classes of England in London were more or less living in a fools' paradise. Our newspaper press has been, happily, singularly guarded and pure. In social life such subjects are seldom if ever mentioned. Many men may have known of them, but the great multitude of women have lived and died without any knowledge of what passes in the very streets in which they dwell. Under the shelter of this unconsciousness every form of evil is multiplied.

I will not ask whether our state is worse at this day than it was in 1820 or 1830, which was a period of extraordinary and bare-faced wickedness. It is enough to say that, with the rapid increase of the population in London, a steady relaxation of all social and moral authority and a perceptible breaking up of the domestic life of the people have continually grown upon us.

At length, the knowledge of these terrible iniquities forced itself upon our attention, and in 1881 a commission took evidence and reported on the immoralities in London, and especially on the

traffic in young girls between London and the Continent. The revelations of that report fall little short of the revelations of the "Pall Mall Gazette." But a blue book is read by few, and, except to those concerned—I may say to experts on the subject—the report of the commission has remained almost unknown. I have never so much as seen it. A bill founded on it, and intended to check these immoral practices, was introduced into the House of Lords. It was much opposed and weakened, and, finally, for want of time, it was dropped. The bill was again introduced in the following year, and with the same result. Once more, in 1884, it was discussed, and again suffered to drop. In the session of the present year, 1885, it passed the House of Lords, weakened to such a point as to afford protection only to girls of fifteen years of age. The bill reached the House of Commons. As usual, it encountered considerable opposition, and, finally, was talked out on a Wednesday, on which day the House rises at six o'clock. It then seemed as if all hope of protection was thrown over to 1886. That is to say, five long years, still with uncertain result, have been wasted over a measure for which the vital necessity to the moral life of England ought to have obtained a peremptory and prompt legislation.

This heartless delay, full of fatal consequences of demoralization and wreck and ruin to the innocent, the helpless of our people, justly aroused the indignation of those to whom justice and mercy are more dear than the redistribution of seats or the disfranchisement for medical relief. Prompted—I might say stung—by an indignant impatience, the editor of the "Pall Mall Gazette," and other like-minded men, defying all antagonists, entered upon their warfare against the dominion of cruelty and lust. I have said elsewhere, that many of those who profoundly sympathize in the motives which induced the "Pall Mall Gazette" to take up the question might have desired its modes and expressions to have been revised and chastened; but that in such a matter of moral life and death, and above all, when the obloquy and calumny of the bad, and hasty and shortsighted censures of some good men, were heaped upon those who entered the furnace to save souls, I should hold it to be not only ungenerous, but cowardly and cruel, not to stand between the handful of men who, for the moral life of England, dared this courageous action, and the whole world of their censors. The substance of this action is intrinsically just and merciful.

The incidental evils that may arise are of a lower order, and depend upon the use or the abuse which individuals may make of these terrible revelations.

I believe that I am correct in saying that in all the States of the Union laws far more stringent and adequate exist for the punishment and the repression of criminal vice.

In many of the States the punishment for rape is still death. Seduction is punished by five long terms of imprisonment. Young girls, in the eye of the law, are infants until they are 18, and, in some States, until they are 21 years of age. The punishment for inveigling, or enticing, or decoying for immoral purposes, by fine or by imprisonment, is justly severe. On the continent of Europe, in like manner, girls are regarded as infants before the law until the age of 18. In England such offenses against a girl of 13 are felony; above 13 they are treated only as a misdemeanor.

By our present legal code a girl cannot give her consent to marriage before the age of 21, but she is regarded as capable of consenting to her own ruin at the age of 13 years. The man who marries her before 21 is punishable by law. The man who ruins a child of 13 escapes with impunity. She may ruin herself at 13, but cannot marry, for defect of consent, till 21. If any one should know that his dog or his cat were detained in any house, the police, with all expedition, could search for his property. But if he knew that his child were detained in the house, neither he nor the police could enter it. His only remedy would be by writ of *habeas corpus*, which could not be obtained for many hours, and perhaps for days; but the ruin of his child might be at any moment. Once more I say, children of 13, and all girls above that age, are supposed to be free agents, and capable of consenting to their own ruin; thus he who ruins them for life escapes with impunity, on the rule "*Volenti non fit injuria*." It has been therefore solemnly argued, by men who have great legal reputation, that the abominable and inhuman trade of the procurer and the procuress cannot be punishable at law, because the end to which their hideous traffic is directed is not illegal. Here we have another legal dictum: the accomplices are not punishable because the principals are within the rights of their liberty.

I have even heard this question asked: "Would you punish the postboy who drives a runaway couple to Gretna Green?" Such

is the levity with which this subject has hitherto been treated, even by men who have a reputation to lose.

The moral sense of this country has been profoundly aroused. Our public newspapers in the provinces, without number, have written with great ardor and indignation, and forty-one public meetings in such places as parts of London, Liverpool, Manchester, and Sheffield have been held. In thirteen days the immense pressure brought to bear upon the Government has compelled it to promise that the Criminal Law Amendment bill shall pass into the statute book before Parliament is prorogued. If it were to be defeated by any of the means which have wasted the last few years, no one can foresee what might be the popular excitement and the indignation in the country. Most assuredly at the next general election, when 2,000,000 new voters, chiefly the fathers and sons of the working-classes, shall appear at polling booths, all those who have obstructed the bill to protect the children and the girls of this country will meet with no toleration.

To-morrow night the Criminal Law Amendment bill will be discussed. A multitude of amendments to weaken its reach and its effect are already on the notice. On the other hand, amendments will be proposed directed to the four points touched on above; viz., first, the raising of the age from 15 to 16, or possibly to 17; secondly, the providing of an effective power of search in all houses where there is reason to believe any child or girl under age may be detained; thirdly, stringent and effectual powers to arrest and punish the perpetrators of this inhuman traffic; and fourthly, to equalize the penalties of solicitation, whether by man or by woman, thereby giving equal protection to both. Such are the chief points for which we are contending.

It will be remembered that the editor of the "Pall Mall Gazette" offered to submit the evidence that he had collected, in proof of the statements that he had made to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, Mr. Samuel Morley, M.P., and myself. To these was afterward added Mr. Reid, M.P. and Queen's Counsel. After four protracted sittings, the following judgment was unanimously framed and signed:

"We have been requested to investigate the truth of the statements contained in the 'Pall Mall Gazette' of the 6th, 7th, 8th, and 10th of July, 1885, under the title of 'The Report of our Secret Commission.'

“In doing so, we decided from the first to exclude any inquiry into charges against particular men or classes of men, or into the conduct of the police officers. We have strictly confined ourselves to inquiring into the system of criminal vice described in that report.

“After carefully sifting the evidence of witnesses, and the materials before us, and without guaranteeing the accuracy of every particular, we are satisfied that, taken as a whole, the statements in the ‘Pall Mall Gazette’ on this question are substantially true.”

HENRY EDWARD,

Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN IN ILLINOIS.

PART I.

MR. LINCOLN was nearly eight years my senior, and settled in Illinois ten years before I did. We first find him in the State splitting rails with Thomas Hanks, in Macon County, in 1830. Not long afterward he made his way to New Salem, an unimportant and insignificant village on the Sangamon River, in the Northern part of Sangamon County, fourteen miles from Springfield.

In 1839 a new county was laid off, named "Ménard," in honor of the first lieutenant-governor of the State, a French Canadian, an early settler of the State, and a man whose memory is held in reverence by the people of Illinois for his enterprise, benevolence, and the admirable personal traits which adorned his character. A distinguished and wealthy citizen of St. Louis, allied to him by marriage, Mr. Charles Pierre Chouteau, is now erecting a monument to him, to be placed in the State-house grounds at Springfield.

The settlement of New Salem, now immortalized as the early home of Lincoln, fell within the new county of "Ménard." Remaining there "as a sort of clerk in a store," to use his own language, he then went into the Black Hawk war, and was elected a captain of a company of mounted volunteers. In one of the great debates between Lincoln and Douglas, at Ottawa, in 1858, in a somewhat patronizing manner and in a spirit of badinage, spoke of having known Lincoln for "twenty-four years," and when a "flourishing grocery-keeper" at New Salem. The occasion was too good a one not to furnish a repartee, and the people insisted that while Lincoln denied that he had been a flourishing "grocery-keeper," as stated, but said that if he had been he was "certain

that his friend, Judge Douglas, would have been his best customer."

The Black Hawk war over, Mr. Lincoln returned to New Salem to eke out a scanty existence by doing small jobs of surveying and by drawing up deeds and legal instruments for his neighbors. In 1834, still living in New Salem, he was one of nine members elected from Sangamon County to the lower house of the Legislature.

I landed at Galena by a Mississippi River steamboat, on the first day of April, 1840, ten years after Hanks and Lincoln were splitting rails in Macon County.

The country was then fairly entered on that marvelous Presidential campaign between Van Buren and Harrison, by far the most exciting election the country has ever seen, and which, in my judgment, will never have a parallel, should the country have an existence for a thousand years. Illinois was one of the seven States that voted for Van Buren, but the Whigs contested the election with great zeal and most desperate energy. Galena, theretofore better known as the Fevre River Lead Mines, still held its importance as the center of the lead-mining region, and was regarded as one of the principal towns in the State in point of population, wealth, and enterprise. But the bulk of population of the State at that time, as well as the weight of political influence, was south of Springfield. Mr. Lincoln was first elected to the lower branch of the Legislature (then sitting at Vandalia) from Sangamon County, in 1834, and that was his first appearance in public life. He was re-elected in 1836, 1838, and 1840, having served in all four terms—eight years. He then peremptorily declined a further election. Before his election to the Legislature, Mr. Lincoln had read law in a fugitive way at New Salem; but arriving at Vandalia as a member of the Legislature, a new field was open to him in the State law library as well as in the miscellaneous library at the capital. He then devoted himself most diligently not only to the study of law, but to miscellaneous reading. He always read understandingly, and there was no principle of law but what he mastered; and such was the way in which he always impressed his miscellaneous readings on his mind, that in his later life people were amazed at his wonderful familiarity with books—even those so little known by the great mass of readers. The seat of government of Illinois having been removed from

Vandalia to Springfield in 1839, the latter place then became the center of political influence in the State. Mr. Lincoln was not particularly distinguished in his legislative service. He participated in the discussion of the ordinary subjects of legislation, and was regarded as a man of good sense and a wise and practical legislator. His uniform fairness was proverbial; but he never gave any special evidence of that masterly ability for which he was afterward distinguished, and which stamped him, as by common consent, the foremost man of all the century. He was a prominent Whig in politics, and took a leading part in all political discussions. There were many men of both political parties in the lower house of the Legislature, during the service of Mr. Lincoln, who became afterward distinguished in the political history of the State, and among them might be mentioned Orlando B. Ficklin, John T. Stuart, William A. Richardson, John A. McClernand, Edward D. Baker, Lewis W. Ross, Samuel D. Marshall, Robert Smith, William H. Bissell, and John J. Hardin, all subsequently members of Congress; and James Semple, James Shields, and Lyman Trumbull, United States Senators.

There were also many men of talent and local reputation who held an honorable place in the public estimation and made their mark in the history of the State. Springfield was the political center for the Whigs of Illinois in 1840.

Lincoln had already acquired a high reputation as a popular speaker, and he was put on the Harrison electoral ticket with the understanding he should canvass the State. Edward D. Baker was also entered as a campaign orator, and wherever he spoke he carried his audience captive by the power of his eloquence and the strength of his arguments. He was one of the most effective stump speakers I ever listened to.

It was his wonderful eloquence and his power as a stump speaker that elected him to Congress from Illinois in a district to which he did not belong, and made him a United States Senator from Oregon when he was a citizen of California.

John T. Stuart was already known by his successful canvass with Douglas, in 1838, as an able speaker and a popular man; and John J. Hardin, of Jacksonville (killed at Buena Vista), was widely known as a popular and successful orator. These Springfield Whigs led off in canvassing the State for Harrison in 1840.

Lincoln and Baker were assigned to the "Wabash Country,"

where, as Baker once told me, they would make speeches one day and shake with the ague the next. It is hard to realize at this day what it was to make a political canvass in Illinois half a century gone by. There were no railroads and but few stage lines. The speakers were obliged to travel on horseback, carrying their saddlebags filled with "hickory" shirts and woolen socks. They were frequently obliged to travel long distances, through swamps and over prairies, to meet their appointments. The accommodations were invariably wretched, and no matter how tired, jaded, and worn the speaker might be, he was obliged to respond to the call of the waiting and eager audiences.

In 1840, Stephen T. Logan, then a resident of Springfield, was one of the best known and most prominent men in the State. Though a Whig, he was not so much a politician as a lawyer. In 1841, he and Mr. Lincoln formed a law partnership which continued until 1843, and there was never a stronger law firm in the State. Like Lincoln, Logan was a Kentuckian, and a self-made man. Though a natural-born lawyer, he had yet studied profoundly the principles of the common law. He was elected a circuit judge in 1835, and held the office until 1837. He displayed extraordinary qualities as a *nisi prius* judge. In 1842, he consented to serve in the lower branch of the Legislature from Sangamon County. He had even more simplicity of character, and was more careless in his dress, than Mr. Lincoln. I shall never forget the first time I ever saw him. It was in the hall of the House of Representatives, on February 10, 1843, and when he was a member of that body. He had a reputation at that time as a man of ability and a lawyer second to no man in the State. I was curious to see the man of whom I had heard so much, and I shall never forget the impression he made on me. He was a small, thin man, with a little wrinkled and wizened face, set off by an immense head of hair, which might be called "frowzy." He was dressed in linsey-woolsey, and wore very heavy shoes. His shirt was of unbleached cotton, and unstarched, and he never encumbered himself with a cravat or other neck-wear. His voice was shrill, sharp, and unpleasant, and he had not a single grace of oratory; but yet, when he spoke, he always had interested and attentive listeners. Underneath this curious and grotesque exterior there was a gigantic intellect. When he addressed himself to a jury or to a question of law before the courts, or made a speech in the Legislature or at

the hustings, people looked upon him and listened with amazement. His last appearance in any public position was as a delegate to the "Peace Convention" at Washington, in the spring of 1861. In his later years he lived the life of a retired gentleman in his beautiful home in the environs of Springfield. His memory has been honored by placing his portrait, one of the most admirable ever painted by Healy, in the magnificent room of the Supreme Court at Springfield.

I never met Mr. Lincoln till the first time I attended the Supreme Court at Springfield, in the winter of 1843 and 1844. He had already achieved a certain reputation as a public speaker, and was rapidly gaining distinction as a lawyer. He had already become widely known as a Whig politician, and his advice and counsel were much sought for by members of the party all over the State. One of the great features in Illinois nearly half a century gone by was the meeting of the Supreme Court of the State. There was but one term of the court a year, and that was held first at Vandalia and then at Springfield. The lawyers from every part of the State had to follow their cases there for final adjudication, and they gathered there from all the principal towns of the State. The occasion served as a reunion of a large number of the ablest men in the State. Many of them had been dragged for hundreds of miles over horrible roads in stage-coaches or by private conveyance. For many years I traveled from Galena, one of the most remote parts of the State, to Springfield in a stage-coach, occupying usually three days and four nights, traveling incessantly, and arriving at the end of the journey more dead than alive. The Supreme Court Library was in the court-room, and there the lawyers would gather to look up their authorities and prepare their cases. In the evening it was a sort of rendezvous for general conversation, and I hardly ever knew of an evening to pass without Mr. Lincoln putting in his appearance. He was a man of the most social disposition, and was never so happy as when surrounded by congenial friends. His penchant for story-telling is well known, and he was more happy in that line than any man I ever knew. But many stories have been invented and attributed to him that he never heard of.

Never shall I forget him as he appeared almost every evening in the court-room, sitting in a cane-bottom chair leaning up against the partition, his feet on a round of the chair, and surrounded by

many listeners. But there was one thing—he never pressed his stories on unwilling ears, nor endeavored to absorb all attention to himself. But his anecdotes were all so droll, so original, so appropriate, and so illustrative of passing incidents, that one never wearied. He never repeated a story or an anecdote, nor vexed the dull ears of a drowsy man by thrice-told tales, and he enjoyed a good story from another as much as any person. There were many good story-tellers in that group of lawyers that assembled evenings in that Supreme Court-room, and among them was the Hon. Thompson Campbell, Secretary of State under Gov. Ford from 1843 to 1846. Mr. Campbell was a brilliant man and a celebrated wit. Though differing in politics, until the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, he and Mr. Lincoln were strong personal friends, and many of his stories, like those of Mr. Lincoln, have gone into the traditions of the State. They were never so happy as when together and listening to the stories of each other. Mr. Campbell was elected to Congress from the Galena district in 1850, and served one term. In 1853, President Pierce appointed him a Judge of the United States Land Court of California.

Mr. Lincoln was universally popular with his associates. Of an even temper, he had a simplicity and charm of manner which took hold at once on all persons with whom he came in contact. He was of the most amiable disposition, and not given to speak unkindly of any person, but quick to discover any weak points that person might have. He was always the center of attraction in the court-room at the evening gatherings, and all felt there was a great void when for any reason he was kept away. The associates of Mr. Lincoln at the bar at this time were, most of them, men of ability, who gave promise of future distinction both at the bar and in the field of politics. The lawyers of that day were brought much closer together than they ever had been since, and the *esprit de corps* was much more marked. Coming from long distances, and suffering great privations in their journeys, they usually remained a considerable time in attendance upon the court. Among the noted lawyers at this time, the friends and associates of Mr. Lincoln, who subsequently reached high political distinction, were John J. Hardin, falling bravely at the head of his regiment at Buena Vista; Lyman Trumbull, for eighteen years U. S. Senator from Illinois; James A. McDougall, Attorney-General of Illinois, and subsequently member of Congress and United States

Senator from California; Stephen A. Douglas, Edward D. Baker, Thompson Campbell, Joseph Gillespie, O. B. Ficklin, Archibald Williams, James Shields, Isaac N. Arnold (who was to become Mr. Lincoln's biographer), Norman H. Purple, O. H. Browning, subsequently United States Senator and Secretary of the Interior, Judge Thomas Drummond, of the United States Circuit Court, and many others, all the contemporaries of Mr. Lincoln, and always holding with him the most cordial and friendly relations. In the Presidential campaign of 1844, Mr. Lincoln canvassed the State very thoroughly for Mr. Clay, and added much to his already well-established reputation as a stump speaker. His reputation also as a lawyer had steadily increased. In August, 1846, he was elected to Congress as a Whig from the Springfield District. Ceasing to attend the courts at Springfield, I saw but little of Mr. Lincoln for a few years. We met at the celebrated River and Harbor Convention at Chicago, held July 5, 6, and 7, 1847. He was simply a looker-on, and took no leading part in the convention. His dress and personal appearance on that occasion could not well be forgotten. It was then for the first time I heard him called *Old Abe*. *Old Abe* as applied to him seemed strange enough, as he was then a young man only thirty-six years of age. One afternoon several of us sat on the sidewalk under the balcony in front of the Sherman House, and among the number the accomplished scholar and unrivaled orator, Lisle Smith. He suddenly interrupted the conversation by exclaiming, "There is Lincoln on the other side of the street! Just look at 'Old Abe!'" and from that time we all called him "Old Abe." No one who saw him can forget his personal appearance at that time. Tall, angular, and awkward, he had on a short-waisted thin swallow-tail coat, a short vest of same material, thin pantaloons, scarcely coming down to his ankles, a straw hat, and a pair of brogans with woolen socks.

Mr. Lincoln was always a great favorite with young men, particularly with the younger members of the bar. It was a popularity not run after, but which followed. He never used the arts of the demagogue to ingratiate himself with any person. Beneath his ungainly exterior he wore a golden heart. He was ever ready to do an act of kindness whenever in his power, particularly to the poor and lowly.

Mr. Lincoln took his seat in Congress on the first Monday in December, 1847. I was in attendance on the Supreme Court of

the United States at Washington that winter, and as he was the only member of Congress from the State who was in harmony with my own political sentiments, I saw much of him and passed a good deal of time in his room. He belonged to a mess that boarded at Mrs. Spriggs' in "Duff Green's Row" on Capitol Hill. At the first session the mess was composed of John Blanchard, John Dickey, A. R. McIlvaine, James Pollock, John Strohm, of Pennsylvania; Elisha Embree, of Indiana; Joshua R. Giddings, of Ohio; A. Lincoln, of Illinois; and P. W. Tompkins, of Mississippi. The same members composed the mess at Mrs. Spriggs' the short session, with the exception of Judge Embree and Mr. Tompkins. Without exception, these gentlemen are all dead.

He sat in the old hall of the House of Representatives, and for the long session was so unfortunate as to draw one of the most undesirable seats in the hall. He participated but little in the active business of the House, and made the personal acquaintance of but few members. He was attentive and conscientious in the discharge of his duties, and followed the course of legislation closely. When he took his seat in the House, the campaign of 1848 for President was just opening. Out of the small number of Whig members of Congress who were favorable to the nomination of General Taylor by the Whig Convention, he was one of the most ardent and outspoken. The following letter addressed to me on the subject will indicate the warmth of his support of General Taylor's nomination :

"WASHINGTON, April 30, 1848.

"DEAR WASHBURN: I have this moment received your very short note asking me if old Taylor is to be used up, and who will be the nominee. My hope of Taylor's nomination is as high—a little higher than when you left. Still the case is by no means out of doubt. Mr. Clay's letter has not advanced his interests any here. Several who were against Taylor, but not for anybody particularly before, are since taking ground, some for Scott and some for McLean. Who will be nominated, neither I nor any one else can tell. Now, let me pray to you in turn. My prayer is, that you let nothing discourage or baffle you, but that in spite of every difficulty you send us a good Taylor delegate from your circuit. Make Baker, who is now with you I suppose, help about it. He is a good hand to raise a breeze. General Ashley, in the Senate from Arkansas, died yesterday. Nothing else new beyond what you see in the papers. Yours truly,

"A. LINCOLN."

I was again in Washington part of the winter of 1849 (after the election of General Taylor), and saw much of Mr. Lincoln. A small number of mutual friends—including Mr. Lincoln—made up

a party to attend the inauguration ball together. It was by far the most brilliant inauguration ball ever given. Of course Mr. Lincoln had never seen anything of the kind before. One of the most modest and unpretending persons present, he could not have dreamed that like honors were to come to him almost within a little more than a decade. He was greatly interested in all that was to be seen, and we did not take our departure until three or four o'clock in the morning. When we went to the cloak and hat room, Mr. Lincoln had no trouble in finding his short cloak, which little more than covered his shoulders, but after a long search was unable to find his hat. After an hour he gave up all idea of finding it. Taking his cloak on his arm he walked out into Judiciary Square, deliberately adjusting it on his shoulders, and started off bareheaded for his lodgings. It would be hard to forget the sight of that tall and slim man, with his short cloak thrown over his shoulders, starting for his long walk home on Capitol Hill at four o'clock in the morning without any hat on. And this incident is akin to one related to me by the librarian of the Supreme Court of the United States. Mr. Lincoln came to the library one day for the purpose of procuring some law books which he wanted to take to his room for examination. Getting together all the books he wanted, he placed them in a pile on a table. Taking a large bandana handkerchief from his pocket, he tied them up; and putting a stick which he had brought with him through a knot he had made in the handkerchief, adjusting the package of books to his stick, he shouldered it, and marched off from the library to his room.

In a few days he returned the books in the same way. Mr. Lincoln declined to run for Congress for a second term, 1848. His old partner and friend, Judge Stephen T. Logan, was the Whig candidate, and, to the amazement of every one, was defeated by a Democrat, Colonel Thomas L. Harris, of "Ménard" County. From 1849, on returning from Congress, until 1854, he practiced law more assiduously than ever before. In respect to that period of his life he once wrote to a friend :

"I was losing interest in politics when the repeal of the Missouri Compromise aroused me again."

There was a great upturning in the political situation in Illinois, brought about by the repeal of the Missouri Compromise in 1854. In the fall of that year an election was to be held in Illinois for members of Congress and for members of the Legislature,

which was to elect a successor to General Shields, who had committed what was to the people of Illinois the unpardonable sin of voting for the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. There was something in that legislation which was particularly revolting to Mr. Lincoln, as it outraged all his ideas of political honesty and fair dealing. There was an exciting canvass in the State, and Mr. Lincoln entered into it with great spirit, and accomplished great results by his powerful speeches. From his standing in the State and from the great service he had rendered in the campaign, it was agreed that if the Republicans and anti-Nebraska men should carry the Legislature, Mr. Lincoln would succeed General Shields. I know that he himself expected it. There is a long and painful history of that Senatorial contest yet to be written, and when the whole truth is disclosed it will throw a flood of new light on the character of Mr. Lincoln, and will add new luster to his greatness, his generosity, his magnanimity, and his patriotism. There is no event in Mr. Lincoln's entire political career that brought to him so much disappointment and chagrin as his defeat for United States Senator in 1855, but he accepted the situation uncomplainingly, and never indulged in reproaches or criticism upon any one; but, on the other hand, he always formed excuses for those who had been charged in not acting in good faith towards him and to those with whom he was associated. He never forgot the obligations he was under to those who had faithfully stood by him in his contest, through good report and evil report. Allied to him by the strongest ties of personal and political friendship, I did all in my power to secure for him, which I did, the support of the members of the Legislature from my Congressional District. The day after the election for Senator he addressed to me a long letter, several pages of letter-paper, giving a detailed account of the contest and the reasons of his action in persuading his friends to vote for and elect Judge Trumbull, and expressing the opinion that I would have acted in the same way if I had been in his place. He then says :

"I regret my defeat moderately, but am not nervous about it. . . . Perhaps it is as well for our grand cause that Trumbull is elected."

He then closes his letter as follows :

"With my grateful acknowledgments for the kind, active, and continual interest you have taken for me in this matter allow me to subscribe myself,

"Yours forever,

"A. LINCOLN."

On the last day of the balloting in the Legislature, it seemed inevitable that a Nebraska Democrat would be elected United States Senator. Judge Trumbull had the votes of five anti-Nebraska Democrats. And of this crisis Mr. Lincoln writes to me :

“ So I determined to strike at once, and accordingly advising my friends to go for him, which they did, and elected him on that, the 10th ballot.”

Though the failure to elect Mr. Lincoln brought grief to many hearts, yet the election of Judge Trumbull was well received by the entire anti-Nebraska party in the State. He proved himself an able, true, and loyal Senator, rendered great services to the Union cause, and proved himself a worthy representative of a great, loyal, and patriotic State.

Notwithstanding the great satisfaction with which Judge Trumbull's election had been received, there was a deep and profound feeling among the old Whigs, the Republicans, and many anti-Nebraska Democrats, that Mr. Lincoln should have had the position, and that he had not been fairly treated. But never a complaint or a suggestion of that kind escaped the lips of Mr. Lincoln. Cheerily and bravely and contentedly he went back to his law office, and business poured in upon him more than ever. In stepping one side and securing the election of Judge Trumbull he “ builded better than he knew.” Had Mr. Lincoln been elected Senator at that time he would never have had the canvass with Judge Douglas in 1858—never have been elected President in 1860 to leave a name that will never die. From 1855 to 1858 Mr. Lincoln was absorbed in the practice of his profession, though he took an active part in the canvass of 1856, when the gallant Colonel Bissell was elected Governor. But what was somewhat remarkable, in all this time, without the least personal effort, and without any resort to the usual devices of politicians, Mr. Lincoln's popularity continued to increase in every portion of the State. In the fall of 1858 there was to be an election of a Legislature which would choose a successor to Judge Douglas, whose term of service was to expire March 3, 1859. The Republican party by this time had become completely organized and solidified, and in Illinois the Republican and Democratic parties squarely confronted each other. Everywhere, by common consent, no Republican candidate for Senator was spoken of except Mr. Lincoln. In the Republican State Convention, in the summer of 1858, a resolution was unanimously

passed designating Mr. Lincoln as the unanimous choice of the Republicans of the State, as the candidate for U. S. Senator, to succeed Judge Douglas. That action is without precedent in the State, and shows the deep hold Mr. Lincoln had on his party.

Without being designated by any authorized body of Democrats, yet by common consent of the party, Judge Douglas became the candidate of the Democratic party. No other candidates were mentioned on either side, either directly or indirectly. The seven joint discussions which the candidates had in different parts of the State have become a part of the political history of the country. It was the battle of the giants. The parties were rallied as one man to the enthusiastic support of their respective candidates, and it is hard for any one not in the State at the time to measure the excitement which everywhere prevailed. There was little talk about Republicanism and Democracy, but it was all "Lincoln and Douglas," or "Douglas and Lincoln." I attended every one of these joint discussions. It was at Freeport, in my Congressional District, which was the bulwark of Republicanism in the State. Two years later it gave Mr. Lincoln a majority for President of nearly fourteen thousand, and my own majority for member of Congress was about the same. The Freeport discussion was held in August. The day was bright, but the wind sweeping down the prairies gave us a chilly afternoon for an out-of-door gathering. In company with a large number of Galena people, we reached Freeport by train about ten o'clock in the morning. Mr. Lincoln had come in from the south the same morning, and we found him at the Brewster House, which was a sort of rallying-point for the Republicans. He had stood his campaign well, and was in splendid condition. He was surrounded all the forenoon by sturdy Republicans, who had come long distances, not only to hear him speak but to see him, and it was esteemed the greatest privilege to shake hands with "Honest old Abe." He had a kind word or some droll remark for every one, and it is safe to say that no one who spoke to him that day will ever have the interview effaced from memory. The meeting was held on a vacant piece of ground, not far from the center of the town. The crowd was immense and the enthusiasm great. Each party tried to outdo each other in the applause for its own candidate. The speaking commenced, but the chilly air dampened the ardor of the audience. Mr. Lincoln spoke deliberately, and apparently under a deep sense of the responsibility which rested

upon him. The questions he propounded to Mr. Douglas he had put in writing (and the answers to which sounded the political death-knell of Mr. Douglas); he read slowly, and with great distinctness. The speech of Mr. Douglas was not up to his usual standard. He was evidently embarrassed by the questions, and floundered in his replies. The crowd was large, the wind was chilly, and there was necessarily much "noise and confusion," and the audience did not take in the vast importance of the debate. On the whole, it may be said that neither party was fully satisfied with the speeches, and the meeting broke up without any display of enthusiasm.

It is not the purpose of this paper to follow the incidents of the Presidential campaign of 1860. The great event in Illinois was the monster Republican mass-meeting held at Springfield during the canvass. It was a meeting for the whole State, and more in the nature of a personal ovation to Mr. Lincoln than merely a political gathering. It was one of the most enormous and impressive gatherings I had ever witnessed. Mr. Lincoln, surrounded by some intimate friends, sat on the balcony of his humble home. It took hours for all the delegations to file before him, and there was no token of enthusiasm wanting. He was deeply touched by the manifestations of personal and political friendships, and returned all his salutations in that off-hand and kindly manner which belonged to him. I know of no demonstration of a similar character that can compare with it except the review by Napoleon of his army for the invasion of Russia, about the same season of the year in 1812. Up to that time it was the grandest army the world had ever seen. A magnificent stand had been erected on the banks of the Niémen, where sat Napoleon surrounded by his marshals. For hours the earth shook under the tread of his unrivaled soldiers. The Emperor sat cold, silent, and impassible. It was not before one of his most splendid divisions of cavalry defiled before him that he broke his silence by saying to the old marshal, Gouvion St. Cyr, "The French are a great people." "Yes, Sire," responded the old republican, "and they deserve more liberty."

E. B. WASHBURN.

(To be concluded.)

319

GEORGE ELIOT'S LIFE.

AFTER reading for the third or fourth time, "George Eliot's Life, as Related in her Letters and Journals," arranged and edited by her second husband, J. W. Cross, our first favorable impression of Mr. Cross has deepened with each fresh examination of his work. In no other biography of the kind is there such a complete self-effacement of the biographer in the subject of his biography. He presents his wife as she lived and labored in her high calling, but he intrudes himself simply to connect the letters and journals into something like a consistent narrative. The reader constantly complains that he has not made his own contributions to the book more voluminous and more luminous. He tells us little or nothing of some matters which he must have thoroughly known, and which he must have felt that his readers ached to know. All the mysteries of George Eliot's life are left unexplained, or only partially explained. His only aim seems to have been to make his work an autobiography, compiled from the letters and journals of his wife. With exasperating modesty and diffidence he declines to venture an opinion on some matters as to which the admirers of George Eliot are divided in opinion. He evidently adores his wife, thinks that what she says in defense of her conduct is a final judgment which no courts in Christendom can overrule, and only appears to state the conditions under which a letter was written, and disappears the moment the information is given. Indeed, as far as Mr. Cross enters into this autobiography of George Eliot he leaves the impression of a somewhat shy gentleman, but still a gentleman of unmistakable honor, intelligence, and integrity. If any faults are to be found in his editorial labors, they are faults of omission and not of commission.

Indeed, if any admirer of George Eliot's writings expected to find in these volumes much which would throw new light on the

genesis and processes of her genius, he is doomed to disappointment. The letters are genuine letters, without a trace of insincerity or affectation; but they chronicle her maladies much more than reveal the method of her creations. The pangs of childbirth are usually considered the most dreadful physical torments entailed on women for the sin or indiscretion of Eve. In reading this biography we are made to believe that they are slight in comparison with the pangs of bookbirth. A third, at least, of her letters and journals is taken up with distressing accounts of her attacks of headache, dyspepsia, rheumatism, and other miseries connected with a frail and infirm bodily constitution. Throughout the work one gets the general impression that he is following, week after week, month after month, the life of an invalid. He hardly seems competent at any time to produce the great works of genius which bear her name. Her spiritual health, when we recur to her novels, seems strangely at variance with the almost constant physical ill health, which she ruefully records in her letters. We can hardly recall another instance of a mind so strong, broad, hardy, beautiful, heroic, and creative, lodged in a body so ill adapted to house such a spiritual guest. Thus, in a letter written when she was twenty-one years old, she says she cannot "attack Mrs. Somerville's connexion of the Physical Sciences" until she has applied four leeches to her suffering head. It was the noble soul in the weak frame that burst through all these obstructions and overcame all these difficulties. As the world goes, she might, like her weak sisters in invalidism, have been justified in leading the life of an effortless valetudinarian, fearful every moment that activity of any kind would bring back her headaches, and plaintively demanding of the healthier members of her family a constant attention to her wants and her whims. It is frightful to think how many inmates of otherwise happy households are cursed by the care they have to bestow on some sick sensitive and selfish relative, who commonly contrives to survive them all.

When we say, however, that the correspondence of George Eliot dwells too much on her constantly recurring bodily troubles, we do not mean that her letters, taken as a whole, are not remarkable specimens of epistolary composition; for they are full of keen observation, weighty thoughts, penetrating glances into the problems of human life, and descriptions of scenery which are as notable for their accuracy as for their vividness and power. When she first appeared

as a novelist she was about thirty-seven years old. We remember that, after reading the first chapters of "Scenes of Clerical Life," published in "Blackwood's Magazine," we were both charmed and puzzled—charmed by the style, and puzzled as to whom, among living celebrities, could the authorship be ascribed; for the writer was evidently a great master of English prose, and his sentences had the last grace of good prose—that of exquisite rhythm. No novice could have written "Amos Barton," for on every page was the evidence that it proceeded from the mind of a person long practiced in the art of forcing language to convey thought and feeling with perfect exactness, and, at the same time, with perfect ease and freedom. The private letters and journals now published show that George Eliot was a great prose writer, in her correspondence with intimate friends, long before the "Scenes of Clerical Life" were dreamed of; yet hardly one of these friends discovered that she was the George Eliot who was talked about in all literary circles, until she confided the fact to such persons as she thought would keep the secret as long as she thought it could be kept from the public.

It is hardly necessary to dwell at length on the first period of her life. She was the child of a thoroughly practical and a thoroughly honest man of the English middle class, but at the same time a man limited in his conceptions to what are called Tory notions in church and State. Caleb Garth in "Middlemarch" is an idealized yet substantially truthful representation of her father. To this father she was literally true to the death. She was the only genius born in the family. Her brothers and sisters doubtless grew up to be admirable specimens of the average virtue and intelligence of the middle classes of Great Britain. They belonged to what Abraham Lincoln called "the plain people"—the people who, in England as in the United States, have done the work which has aided the slow progress of that real civilization which is gradually lifting the lower and dependent classes into a higher rank among the forces which control the politics of the few nations on the globe which have arrived to the dignity of being ruled by constitutional governments. But the one daughter of this excellent family, in whose career we are especially interested, was a thinker from her childhood, and at the same time the most affectionate of human beings. She could not, as a girl, live without love, and could not accept an opinion or a creed which she had

not verified by her own vital experience, whether the experience came from the exercise of her reason or from the feelings of her heart. As she grew up into womanhood, she was overcome by the emotional side of Evangelical Christianity, and her whole soul was absorbed in it. It afforded her what she thought a substantial ground for her two primary impulses, which were perfect self-sacrifice for the good of others, and an awful sense of the obligations of duty. In this period of her life she showed all the peculiarities which prophesied a new Protestant saint. She knew enough, as she thought, of the pleasures of the world to appreciate all their value, and to condemn them as valueless. She was overcome by the sense of sin, even in indulging in what the general theological sense of the world has come to consider comparatively sinless. She had, as a woman of genius, an instinctive sense of the splendor and beauty of the great authors she had read and assimilated, and yet she had a fear that her intense appreciation of exceptional but still unsanctified genius might be a grievous violation of her duty. Her letter to Miss Lewis, at the age of twenty, on the bad effects of novels, illustrates her renunciation of even the cherished companions of her youthful years. She had, at the age of eight, a passionate admiration of "Waverley." During this interval of evangelical piety she half surrendered her delight in the novels of Scott. She read books which taught that the indulgence of her taste for even innocent works of fiction might lead her down to perdition. Her sense of the folly of this extreme creed kept her on the sane path of reasonable evangelicism; but she persisted in it until she read the works of Isaac Taylor. This good Christian, in his many books, especially in his "Physical Theory of a Future Life," and in his elaborate discussion of facts connected with "Ancient Christianity," unsettled, in her mind, that faith in the Christian religion it was designed to establish on an indestructible foundation. The book which completed the work of making her reject all orthodox creeds was Charles Hennell's "Inquiry Concerning the Origin of Christianity." When, afterwards, she met, in London, Mackay, Lewes, Herbert Spencer, not to mention others, all her old theological opinions were cast aside by her understanding, while they still held a strange influence over her heart and soul. It is curious that her greatest efforts in characterization are those which embody men or women of religious genius. As far as we remem-

ber, there is not a single character in any of her novels who attracts our sympathies by his skepticism. The intense experience through which she passed as an unquestioning Christian animates all her novels. In her life she never swerved from religion, as she understood it. In all her published letters she expresses something like horror at vulgar irreligion. No novelist or dramatist has approached her in her singular power of embodying religious character; and the reason is that she had "experienced" religion vitally. All after-addition of skepticism added not any element to her power. To the last she made religion the central part of life, for in religion she found her deepest belief that self-sacrifice for others was the fundamental base of all ethics, and that to give humanity what a Yankee might call "a shove forwards" was the greatest thing that the best and noblest men and women could hope, in this imperfect world, to do.

One of the puzzles of her life is that, in matters regarding religion, she allowed her understanding to adopt opinions which her deepest reason and affections repudiated. Her heart ever gave the lie to her head :

"The best good Christian she,
Although she knew it not."

But the fact remains that in her published works the reader would search in vain for any indication of her private skeptical tendencies.

What some liberal critics would call the great mistake of her life, if not, as both English and American matronhood assert, the great blot on her character, was her marriage to George H. Lewes. According to English law the marriage was illegal. The wife of Mr. Lewes abandoned him after committing adultery; she felt, or pretended to feel, remorse for her conduct, and was received back into the household she had dishonored. Then some new seducer tempted her to fly away from her husband and children. The home became homeless. By a technicality of English law, Lewes had forfeited his right to be divorced from his faithless partner, because, in a moment of compassion, he had received her back as his "lawfully" wedded wife. In this condition, as a twice-dishonored husband, he met with Miss Evans. He was fascinated by her, and she gradually became fascinated by him. There was no outward beauty on either side; Lewes was one of the homeliest men in Great Britain, and Miss Evans had no personal attractions, if we ex-

cept the sweetness of her voice and the singular beauty of expression in her eyes. Each saw the visage of the other "in the mind." Miss Evans, repudiating the technicality of the English law, consented to be united to Mr. Lewes, went abroad with him, was married to him, we think, in some foreign city, and returned to England a kind of social rebel, frowned upon by all women except those intimate friends who knew her motives and never faltered in their friendship. As she never sought "society," and rather disliked it, she bore with exemplary patience all the social disadvantages of her illegal rather than immoral conduct. Seven years before her union we find in one of her letters this remark about the novel of "Jane Eyre," then the literary sensation of the season: "All self-sacrifice is good, but one would like it to be in a somewhat nobler cause than that of a diabolical law which chains a man soul and body to a putrefying carcass." After her marriage, she wrote to her friend Mrs. Bray that "any unworldly, unsuperstitious woman who is sufficiently acquainted with the realities of life can pronounce my relations to Mr. Lewes immoral; I can only understand by remembering how subtle and complex are the influences which mold opinion."

Whatever may be thought of the legality or morality of the connection, there can be no doubt it led to the happiest results to both parties. Lewes had been practically homeless for two years. There was danger that his children would grow up uneducated and uncared for. He was fast drifting into Bohemian habits. Four years after his new marriage, Mrs. Lewes states in her journal that their "double life is more and more blessed—more and more complete." A few weeks after, Lewes writes in his journal that he owes an intellectual debt of gratitude to Herbert Spencer. He says:

"My acquaintance with him was the brightest ray in a very dreary, wasted period of my life. . . . I owe him another and deeper debt. It was through him that I learned to know Marion—to know her was to love her—and since then my life has been a new birth. To her I owe all my prosperity and happiness. God bless her!"

It is curious that on this first introduction he did not make a favorable impression. He was a brilliant converser on all topics that come up for discussion at a dinner table, was one of the best story-tellers in London, was a man of various accomplishments,

seeming to know everything without having thoroughly mastered anything, and with a self-confidence and self-sufficiency which offended many grave people who were not captivated by his wit and pleasantry. The austere Lucy Aiken once met him at a dinner party, and in a letter to Doctor Channing records her dislike of him as a flippant, pretentious and irreverent person. Miss Evans, on first seeing him, says that in appearance he was "a miniature Mirabeau." In March, 1853, he seems to have overcome her repugnance, for she says, "Lewes is always genial and amusing. He has quite won my liking in spite of myself." A month after he had advanced in her opinion, for she writes to Mrs. Bray :

"Lewes especially is kind and attentive to me, and has quite won my regard after having had a good deal of my vituperation. Like a few other people in the world, he is much better than he seems—a man of heart and conscience wearing a mask of flippancy."

During the next fifteen months he gained her love—love, we think, born somewhat of compassion in considering his desolate home and neglected children, but which, after their union, ripened into an intensity of affection seldom equaled in the annals of matrimony. After completing any of her great books, the manuscript concludes with a dedication of the work to her "dear husband." The manuscript of "Romola" may be selected as an example. The inscription runs thus :

"To the husband whose perfect love has been the best source of her insight and strength, this manuscript is given by his devoted wife and writer."

"Romola" was the novel which, of all her works, most tasked the energies of her mind, and most exhausted her bodily strength. "I began it," she said to Mr. Cross, "a young woman—I finished it an old woman." Yet the inscription of "Middlemarch" to Lewes, nine years after, shows that the "old woman" still glowed with undiminished affection for her "George," as she lovingly called him :

"To my dear husband, George Henry Lewes, in this nineteenth year of our blessed union."

Indeed, the honey-moon, in the case of this couple, lasted as long as the life of the husband.

Lewes himself was also immensely benefited by his marriage.

She was his salvation. All the works for which he will be remembered were written in the years when her ardent sympathy with his labors was at once his inspiration and his guide. His love and reverence for her were unbounded, and exhibited on all occasions, public as well as private. Mr. Estcott has, since the autobiography was published, given quite a vivid picture of him as he appeared at the Sunday receptions of his wife :

"The function," he says, "was more like a religious ceremonial than a social reunion, and Mr. Lewes played to perfection the part of Hierophant. The gifted lady sat in the center of a crowd of worshipers, of whom some were permitted to hold personal converse with her. But the majority gazed at her reverently and mutely from afar, as if they were looking upon the Beatific Vision. If any one spoke in too loud a tone, or spoke at all, when George Eliot happened to be speaking herself, he was at once met with a 'hush' of reprehension by Mr. Lewes, and was made to feel that he had perpetrated a sort of impiety."

He continues :

"George Eliot had unquestionably immeasurable charm of mind, manner, and conversation for those who knew her well; but I must say that I never advanced beyond the outer circle of worshipers, and that I always felt myself one of the Levites at the gate."

We have heard a number of visitors at these receptions, both those who were in the inner and those who were in the outer circle, relate their experiences, and they all agree in ascribing to Mr. Lewes this devotional air and attitude to his wife, while those who happened to be in the inner circle on such occasions agree in ascribing to Mrs. Lewes the charm of unpretentious, unassuming modesty of behavior while conversing with such thinkers as Spencer and Mill.

But perhaps we owe to this marriage—illegal in a technical point of view, but violating no principle of absolute morality—the great works of fiction which have rendered the name of George Eliot illustrious, and which promise to live as long as the English literature of the nineteenth century interests people who speak the English language. When she first thought of writing a story, he doubted whether she had the power of dramatic presentation. Still he urged her to try, and in less than two months she wrote the first of the "Scenes of Clerical Life"—that devoted to the sad fortunes of "Amos Barton." Lewes at once appreciated it, and sent it to John Blackwood for publication in "Blackwood's

Magazine." He was just the person to look after his wife's interests in dealing with publishers. He saved her from all the annoyances connected with authorship, and finding that she was susceptible to that commonest kind of criticism which ignores the writer's aim and purpose, he at last selected for her reading all those portions of contemporary comments on her works which would please her, and concealed from her all those which betrayed ignorance, envy, or malice and prejudice. It was not that she wished to be praised or flattered—she was superior to that ignoble ambition—but her sensitive nature was hurt by reading a criticism which misconceived the whole spirit of the work on which she had conscientiously expended months of labor, and every page of which represented an expenditure of vitality which her weak physical frame could ill spare. Criticism which indicated an interior glance into the processes of her mind, and proved that the critic had, for the time, assumed her point of view before objecting to her treatment of a subject, was always welcome to her; but purely external criticism, which condemned without in the least understanding her, had the effect of throwing her into long moods of depression, during which she felt as if the very sources of her creative activity were smitten as by paralysis. Lewes did her great service by not allowing her to be disturbed by reviews which could do her no good, but which might do her much evil.

And then, at the time of their union they were poor, and they were called upon not only to support and educate his children, but to support the wretched mother of his children—the last task one of almost superhuman benevolence. They had to look sharply at every sixpence that was spent, and often deprive themselves of the simplest pleasures. Now Lewes knew, to a farthing, the exact money-value of every drop of ink which flowed from his wife's pen. It is refreshing to observe that, from the moment the success of the "Scenes of Clerical Life" indicated the province of literature that the genius of George Eliot, as distinguished from her talent, was to enrich with new and original works, money poured into the family with almost bewildering rapidity. For "Adam Bede" Blackwood gave her £800 for four years' copyright; its success was so great that he sent her voluntarily an additional £400 before the first year of its publication had elapsed; and then came another £800 for the second year after the agreement. It was evident that Blackwood felt that he had ob-

tained a great prize in the new author, and that he wished to retain the prize by his liberality. For "The Mill on the Floss" he gave £2,000 for the first edition of 4,000 copies. When "Romola" was in preparation, Smith, Elder & Co. offered £10,000 for the copyright at home and abroad, and they finally paid £7,000 for its serial publication in the "Cornhill Magazine." For "Middlemarch" and "Daniel Deronda" the author must have received much larger sums. The Harpers, of New York, paid £1,200 merely for the advance sheets of "Middlemarch." In November, 1859, she writes to a friend that the offers made to her by rival publishers are so great, that if she could be seduced by them she might have written three poor novels, and made her fortune in a year. "Happily," she adds, "I have no need to exert myself when I say, 'Avaunt thee, Satan!' Satan, in the form of bad writing and good pay, is not seductive to me."

It is with regret that want of space prevents us from entering upon an elaborate consideration of many topics that these volumes suggest. We have said that they do not shed so much new light on the interior facts and processes of her mind as the reader could wish. There is one passage, however, in a letter to John Blackwood, while she was engaged in writing "The Mill on the Floss," which is suggestive of her method. "My stories," she says, "grow in me like plants, and this is only in the leaf-bud. I have faith that the flower will come. Not enough faith, though, to make me like the idea of beginning to print till the flower is fairly out—till I know the end as well as the beginning." This indicates her marvelous power of representing character as it grows. Dickens once said that in reading the novels of many of his contemporaries it appeared to him as if the authors lived next door to their characters. "Now," he added, "I always live *inside* of mine." George Eliot might, with even greater truth, have said this of her own creations. She placed herself, by imagination and sympathy, at the inmost core of the natures of her characters, and delineated them from within, not approached them from without. She did not merely look at them, but she looked into them, and also looked through them to the spiritual laws they obeyed or violated. She kept a sort of relentless watch on all the subtle, interior movements of their minds and hearts, and they could not pass into a dreaming sleep without being still subject to this piercing glance into the fantasies and wild incidents of their dreams.

It has always seemed to us that the genius and character of George Eliot widened and deepened as the years passed on, and that "*Romolo*," "*Middlemarch*," and "*Daniel Deronda*" are the greatest of her works. They certainly show that she did not repeat the characters she had once depicted, but enlarged her field of characterization with each successive novel. However this opinion may be questioned, there can be no doubt that Lewes, after his union with her, became a much better man and a much abler writer than before. He produced, by patient thought and study, several scientific works of decided merit. The union between the two continued "blessed" up to the day of his unexpected death, which occurred in November, 1878. The shock to her of this event was terrible. She at last recovered sufficiently to see her intimate friends, and to arrange her husband's MSS. for publication. In every duty she was called upon to perform she was cordially assisted by Mr. J. W. Cross, with whom and with whose family she had enjoyed an uninterrupted friendship for more than thirteen years. He had such a love and reverence for her that it is hardly a matter of wonder that the friendship ended in marriage, about eighteen months after the death of Mr. Lewes. She lived only a little more than seven months afterwards, dying on the 22d of December, 1880. The paragraph with which Mr. Cross concludes the autobiography may well serve as the conclusion of this brief article :

"The place that may belong to her in the minds and in the hearts of future generations will be finally adjudged on the merits of her works. We who write and we who read to-day will never know that final verdict, but I think that those of us who loved her may trust to it with confidence."

EDWIN P. WHIPPLE.

VICE-PRESIDENTIAL POLITICS IN '64.

THERE are two incidents in regard to the nomination of Vice-President in 1864 which for obvious reasons did not get into the newspapers of that day, but which bit of history may be of interest.

It will be remembered that Mr. Chase was using his position as Secretary of the Treasury to aid in his candidature for the Presidency as early as the winter and spring of 1864. That was supposed to have created some coolness between him and Mr. Lincoln.

Early in the spring of that year, a prominent Treasury official, who held his office directly from Mr. Chase, without the intervention of either the President or the Senate, but yet who controlled the disposition of more property and the avenues of making more fortunes than any other subordinate Treasury official, and who afterward held as large a controlling influence with Mr. Seward, but in quite a different direction, came to the head-quarters of the Department of Virginia and North Carolina, ostensibly upon official business.

After that was finished, the actual object of his visit was disclosed by a question, in substance as follows :

“There has been some criticism, General, based on the assertion that Mr. Chase is using the powers of his office to aid his Presidential aspirations. What do you think of Mr. Chase’s action, assuming the reports true ?”

“I see no objection to his using his office to advance his Presidential aspirations, by every honorable means, providing Lincoln will let him do it. It is none of my business, but I have for some time thought that Mr. Lincoln was more patient than I should have been, and if he does not object, nobody else has either the power or right to do so.”

“Then, General, you approve of Mr. Chase’s course in this regard ?”

"Yes, certainly; he has a right to use in a proper manner every means he has to further a laudable ambition."

"As Chase is a Western man," said my visitor, "the Vice-Presidency had better come from the East. Who, General, do you think will make a good candidate with Mr. Chase?"

"There are plenty of good men," I answered, "but as Chase is very pronounced as an anti-slavery man and free-soiler, I think that Gen. John A. Dix, of New York, ought to be selected to go on his ticket, and thus bring to his banner, both in convention and at the polls, the war Democrats, of whom Mr. Dix claims to be a fair representative."

"You are a war Democrat, General; would you take that position with Mr. Chase yourself?"

"Are you specifically authorized by Mr. Chase to put to me that question, and report my answer to him for his consideration?"

"You may rest assured," was the reply, "that I am fully empowered by Mr. Chase to put the question, and he hopes the answer will be favorable."

"Say then to Mr. Chase that I have no desire to be Vice-President. I am but forty-five years old; I am in command of a fine army; the closing campaign of the war is about beginning, and I hope to be able to do some further service for the country, and I should not, at my time of life, wish to be Vice-President if I had no other position. Assure him that my determination in this regard has no connection with himself personally. I will not be a candidate for any elective office whatever until this war is over."

"I will report your determination to Mr. Chase, and I can assure you that from what I know of his feelings he will hear it with regret."

Within three weeks afterward a gentlemen who stood very high in Mr. Lincoln's confidence came to me at Fort Monroe. This was after I had learned that Grant had allotted to me a not unimportant part in the coming campaign around Richmond, of the results of which I had the highest hope, and for which I had been laboring, and the story of which has not yet been told, but may be hereafter.

The gentleman informed me that he came from Mr. Lincoln; this was said with directness, because the messenger and myself had been for a very considerable time in quite warm, friendly

relations, and I owed much to him, which I can never repay save with gratitude.

He said : " The President, as you know, intends to be a candidate for re-election, and as his friends indicate that Mr. Hamlin is no longer to be a candidate for Vice-President, and as he is from New England, the President thinks that his place should be filled by some one from that section ; and aside from reasons of personal friendship which would make it pleasant to have you with him, he believes that being the first prominent Democrat who volunteered for the war, your candidature would add strength to the ticket, especially with the war Democrats, and he hopes that you will allow your friends to co-operate with his to place you in that position."

I answered : " Please say to Mr. Lincoln that while I appreciate with the fullest sensibility this act of friendship and the compliment he pays me, yet I must decline. Tell him," I said laughingly, " with the prospects of the campaign, I would not quit the field to be Vice-President, even with himself as President, unless he will give me bond with sureties, in the full sum of his four years' salary, that he will die or resign within three months after his inauguration. Ask him what he thinks I have done to deserve the punishment, at forty-six years of age, of being made to sit as presiding officer over the Senate, to listen for four years to debates more or less stupid, in which I can take no part or say a word, nor even be allowed a vote upon any subject which concerns the welfare of the country, except when my enemies might think my vote would injure me in the estimation of the people, and therefore, by some parliamentary trick, make a tie on such question, so I should be compelled to vote ; and then at the end of four years (as nowadays no Vice-President is ever elected President), and because of the dignity of the position I had held, not to be permitted to go on with my profession, and therefore with nothing left for me to do save to ornament my lot in the cemetery tastefully, and get into it gracefully and respectably, as a Vice-President should do. No, no, my friend ; tell the President I will do everything I can to aid in his election if nominated, and that I hope he will be, as until this war is finished there should be no change of administration."

" I am sorry you won't go with us," replied my friend, " but I think you are sound in your judgment."

I asked : "Is Chase making any headway in his candidature?"

"Yes, some ; but he is using the whole power of the Treasury to help himself."

"Well, that's the right thing for him to do."

"Do you really think so?"

"Yes ; why ought not he to do it, if Lincoln lets him?"

"How can Lincoln help letting him?"

"By tipping him out. If I were Lincoln I should say to Mr. Chase, 'My Secretary of the Treasury, you know that I am a candidate for re-election, as I suppose it is proper for me to be. Now every one of my equals has a right to be a candidate against me, and every citizen of the United States is my equal who is not my subordinate. Now, if you desire to be a candidate, I will give you the fullest opportunity to be one, by making you my equal and not my subordinate, and I will do that in any way that will be the most pleasant to you, but things cannot stay as they now are.' You see, I think it is Mr. Lincoln's and not Mr. Chase's fault that he is using the Treasury against Mr. Lincoln."

"Right again!" said my friend, "I will tell Mr. Lincoln every word you have said."

What happened after is a matter of history.

BENJAMIN F. BUTLER.

GENERAL MCCLELLAN'S CHANGE OF BASE.

GENERALS McCLELLAN and Fitz John Porter have recently published articles in the "Century Magazine," on the campaign against Richmond in 1862, explaining to some extent the causes of that failure to capture the capital of the Confederacy. These papers are written from the same point of view, and are clearly intended to fasten upon Lincoln and Stanton the chief responsibility of the failure. They write in the same spirit, they use the same materials, and they work to a common end—thus showing a mutual understanding, as was to have been expected from their intimacy during the war.

Their efforts to make history have been widely read ; and owing to the grave accusations made against the most beloved of our Presidents, they should be carefully considered and critically analyzed. If they have made statements not consistent with each other, and not confirmed by facts well established, the truth of history demands a refutation of their perversion of it. I propose to point out some of the errors into which the generals have fallen, and to note some of their inconsistencies.

It is charged that McClellan was forced to place and maintain his army in a dangerous position on the two banks of the Chickahominy, in consequence of a running promise of Lincoln to send the force of McDowell to his assistance by land ; that this promise was not kept ; that McDowell never came ; but that in consequence of the constant expectation of his coming a base of supplies had to be maintained on the Pamunkey, in order to feed the 40,000 men whenever they should appear, and that the right wing of the army was thereby made weak and invited attack from Lee.

General Porter says :

" The faulty location of the Union army was from the first realized by Gen. McClellan, and became daily an increasing cause of care and anxiety to him ;

not the least disturbing element of which was the impossibility of quickly re-enforcing his right wing or promptly withdrawing it to the south bank. That this dilemma was known to so intelligent a commander as Lee could not be doubted."

The error, then, was certainly known to General McClellan at the time it was committed, and Generals McClellan and Porter had no doubt that it was soon known to Lee. It appears by their representation to have been a great fault. The question is, whose was it? Having declared it a fault from the beginning, they then seek to convey the impression that the responsibility for it belonged to the authorities in Washington, and they try by insinuations and statements to demonstrate that the Pamunkey base was a necessity growing out of the promise to send McDowell with 40,000 more men, and hence that General McClellan was fatally cramped in his movements by the location of the base. They imply that had General McClellan not expected General McDowell he would not have held a position so illy chosen, or that he would have escaped from it before any trouble arose.

The reader may be surprised to learn that there was no connection whatever between McDowell's coming and McClellan's stay on the Chickahominy, but such is the fact. McClellan himself relates the circumstances which prove it. In his report to the War Department (printed in Vol. I., p. 542, "Moore's Rebellion Record"), McClellan says he was at first in favor of moving towards Richmond from Urbanna, but that circumstances made it unadvisable; that at a council of war, held at Fairfax, the corps commanders decided to move by the Yorktown route; that he agreed and sent word to Stanton, who replied that Lincoln made no objection. It further appears that Lincoln was rather opposed to the plan agreed upon at first, and only assented when he found it was the unanimous judgment of the high officers upon whom devolved the duty of endeavoring to take the rebel city.

This admission clearly relieves Lincoln and Stanton of the whole responsibility of selecting the line of operations, and from all that grew out of that selection which was not directly due to their arbitrary interference.

Now the Pamunkey as a base became a necessity of the route selected, and it was chosen before any question about McDowell had arisen. The first step in the plan of moving by the peninsula was to secure an immense flotilla of transports adapted to the naviga-

tion of the rivers, and they were loaded with supplies and ordered to that base preliminary to all else. Head-quarters were established on the Pamunkey at the earliest moment—16th May—and from that moment the supplies for the whole of McClellan's army had to be protected, whether McDowell came or came not. It was a necessity from the moment of McClellan's arrival, and there can be no dispute about it. On May 20, of his own accord, wholly uninfluenced from Washington, McClellan divided his army and put the strongest half across the Chickahominy. The dispatches of that period make no reference to the promise of McDowell's coming as a reason for dividing the army, nor do they show any doubt of the propriety of the movement or of the entire safety of the plan. McClellan complained of not having troops enough, and of other things, but there is no word intimating that he is held in his dangerous position by McDowell's non-appearance. Most of the time he seemed to be in a cheerful frame of mind, and held out the idea of soon being within shelling distance of the rebel capital.

The one anxious man was Abraham Lincoln. On June 3 the President telegraphed :

"With the continuous rains I am *very anxious* about the Chickahominy—so close in your rear and crossing your line of communication. Please look to it.

"A. LINCOLN."

McClellan answered on the same day :

"As the Chickahominy has been almost the only obstacle in my way for several days, your Excellency may rest assured it has not been overlooked."

This was a diplomatic way of saying to the President : "Do you regard me as a military fool, not knowing enough to look out for my base ?" If McClellan had been held there at the time by Mr. Lincoln, the opportunity was now given by the telegram for him to explain the danger, and he could scarcely have refrained from telling him all about it, instead of quieting him with the assurance that the communications had been looked after. The answer exhibited no sign of apprehension, and no anxiety because of the division of the army. That he felt none is evident ; because three days later he sent word to Stanton (dispatch June 7) :

"I shall be in perfect readiness to move forward and take Richmond the moment McCall reaches me, and the ground will admit the passage of artillery."

How could McClellan have felt able to take Richmond if, at

this time, he and Fitz John Porter were trembling with fear lest Lee or Johnston should pounce upon and take *them*? He was not despondent at all. On May 26 he telegraphed that he did not think the defenses of Richmond were formidable, and he hoped soon to be in shelling distance; and yet his army was divided, and had been divided for nearly a week. Besides, on this very 26th of May, when he was so hopeful, he detached Fitz John Porter with a large force from the right wing—the very wing which was so weak as to invite an attack from Lee—sent him away to Hanover Court House, and two days later went there himself in person. That was an unaccountable proceeding on the supposition that they were aware that Lee knew the perilous condition of the Union army and was ready to strike the weak right wing. If there were a necessity for sending off Porter, certainly there was none for McClellan's being away at so critical a moment. What would have become of the army had Lee swooped down when the two chief officers were absent?

The troops crossed the Chickahominy May 20, and for thirty-five days the army was divided by the river, and of course in peril. Porter says that from the first the fault was realized. Then he goes on to say that, on the morning of June 26, he

“Was informed of a large increase of forces opposite Reynolds, and before noon the Confederates gave evidence of an intention to cross the river at Meadow Bridge and Mechanicsville. . . . Thus the attitude of the two armies toward each other was changed. Yesterday McClellan was rejoicing at the success of his advance towards Richmond.”

The statement now made in this last quotation is a flat contradiction of the averment that the failure to take Richmond was due to the division of the army, about which they had been so anxious. They were happy until the morning of June 25, when the rebels confronted Reynolds. They thought everything had gone well, and rejoiced as successful generals should rejoice. They were in blissful ignorance that Lincoln had been holding them for a month in mortal peril astride the river by an unfulfilled promise to send McDowell. They had not discovered they were staying there to guard provisions for McDowell's soldiers to eat when they should come. They thought themselves on the aggressive, and “yesterday,” the 25th, McClellan was rejoicing!

It is a remarkable circumstance connected with the ingenious theory put forth by these generals as an excuse for their failure,

that the change in their frame of mind occurred on the 26th of June; because, as luck would have it, the bridges were all completed and communications were perfected on the day before. On the 25th of June the inability to reinforce the right wing, and the impossibility of withdrawing it promptly to the south side of the river, ceased. The danger which had caused their daily increasing anxiety ended with the completion of the bridges, and the invitation they had been holding out to Lee to come on while it was impossible to strengthen the right wing was withdrawn; yet now sadness took the place of joy. All was changed! In a single night, after their danger growing out of inability to concentrate had disappeared, they suddenly discover the peril of waiting for McDowell, and gloom settles over the tents of head-quarters!

But the generals furnish another piece of testimony which also overthrows their new theory. They were to move as soon as McCall arrived and the roads were ready for artillery. McCall arrived on June 12, and had been with McClellan a fortnight. Lee first found the roads passable, and, as it appears, concentrated his army; and on the 26th of June attempted to crush the right wing, as McClellan had from the first supposed he would try to do. Porter calls for help, and what does McClellan say? Does he tell him that Lincoln has so divided the army that he cannot assist? Not a bit of this nonsense. McClellan says that he has sent to Keyes and Sumner and Heintzleman and Franklin, but that none of them can spare any men. Why should Porter ask for men if none could cross to his support? Why should McClellan ask his corps commanders how many they could spare if none could cross the river? * It is not thus that great generals act.

No; McClellan did not fail to concentrate his army because Mr. Lincoln had prevented such action, but because he was carrying out a plan of campaign of his own choosing, which necessitated a base on the Pamunkey and a division of the army at the river. He thought that that route, on the whole, was the best way to approach Richmond, and therefore he took the chances, whatever they were, and accepted the necessity of maintaining and defending his supplies.

A curious feature of this case is the strenuous insistence by McClellan and Porter of the binding obligation upon them of the or-

* See Vol. I., page 585, "Moore's Reb. Rec."

der given by Stanton to McDowell to join McClellan. McClellan says that as the order had not been revoked—only suspended—he could not abandon the Chickahominy, because he was looking for the coming of McDowell. But he had already shown that he could not get away because his bridges were not finished till the 25th, and he only confutes himself by charging his stay upon the President when the other reason was so much more conclusive and indisputable.

Porter undertakes to fortify McClellan (page 310 of "Century") by saying that the assurances of McDowell's coming were kept up as late as June 26. Yet he knew that on the 25th McClellan had decided to change his base; that on the 24th of May, a month previous, Lincoln had sent word that McDowell was to go to the aid of Banks; and that McClellan had replied on the same day that he would get along without him. From that moment McClellan had known that McDowell was not to go to him, and there was no intimation that he would go from that day on, until McClellan decided to move on the James. Having sent word to Lincoln, May 24, that he would do without McDowell, it is monstrously absurd to pretend that he must hang upon the river in chronic peril waiting for him to come; and especially after Mr. Lincoln had sent him the memorable dispatch of May 25, in which he said: "I think the time is near when you must either attack Richmond or give up the job." This dispatch, coming the day after the announcement that McDowell had been sent to Banks, could not by any twisting be construed as requiring the army to remain where it was in order to feed or receive McDowell, and showed that both generals knew they were expected to get away from the river the moment the roads were in condition.

The fallacy of this theory, that they were held to the river by expectations of the coming of McDowell, is queerly exposed by General Porter himself. On page 311 of June "Century" he says: "In the middle of June General McClellan intrusted to me the management of affairs on the north bank of the Chickahominy, and confided to me his plans, as well as his hopes and apprehensions. His plans embraced defensive arrangements against an attack from Richmond upon our weak right flank. We did not fear the results of such an attack if made by the forces from Richmond alone; but if, in addition, we were to be attacked by Jackson's forces, suspicions of whose approach were already aroused, we felt

that we should be in danger. But as Jackson had thus far prevented McDowell from joining us, *we trusted that McDowell, Banks, and Fremont would be able to prevent him from joining Lee, or, at least, would give timely warning of his escape from their front, and follow close upon his heels.*"

Being in front of McDowell of course placed Jackson between McDowell and Porter. This was the fact; and the above statement proves that Porter and McClellan were aware of it in the middle of June. They knew Jackson was not that kind of a commander who would allow the positions to be reversed, and they could not have had the faintest shadow of hope that McDowell could march around Jackson and get to them first, and especially when, at the very moment, their suspicions were aroused that Jackson was on the way. It is absurd on the face of it; and in penning the paragraph the general for the moment quite forgot how desperately they were clinging to the river in expectation of McDowell's joining them.

Porter says: "Yesterday (25th June) McClellan was rejoicing over the success of his advance towards Richmond. He was still assured of McDowell's junction. To-day all the united available forces in Virginia were to be thrown upon his right flank, which was not in a convenient position to be supported." In this statement Porter is still using the expectation of McDowell's coming, which he has shown did not exist after the middle of June, and he is still holding on to the theory that the right wing could not be supported or withdrawn in spite of the circumstance that General McClellan had completed the bridges the day before, that is on the 25th, and that he had confided to Porter his intention to transfer his whole force to the south bank in case events should justify it. Now if Porter's 27,000 men could conveniently be taken to the south bank of the river, it is nonsense to say that the river was any obstacle *then* to the sending of aid to Porter on the north bank. General Porter is here in a dilemma. He could not say that the reason for his not being supported was the presence of the rebel army in front of McClellan, because he is showing that his own peril is due to the concentration of the whole rebel army in front of himself; and to make that assertion good he gives McClellan away entirely, for McClellan had reported the reason for not aiding Porter to be the impossibility of sparing the men. To cover the great discrepancy Porter falls back on the exploded theory that the river

could not be crossed, and that President Lincoln was to blame for not sending McDowell.

Several things are therefore made certain, namely :

1. That the plan of moving on Richmond was adopted by McClellan, and that Lincoln was not responsible for it.

2. That the plan as adopted provided a base on the Pamunkey.

3. That the supplies being sent to the base must be protected as a military necessity, without regard to the sending or withholding of McDowell.

4. That the crossing of a part of his army to the south bank of the Chickahominy was the act of McClellan alone, and that Lincoln and Stanton were not responsible for it.

5. That McClellan at the time gave as the reason for remaining in his position the impossibility of moving before the bridges were completed and the roads in condition to pass artillery.

6. That the theory of being compelled to protect the supplies on the Pamunkey in order to meet the conditions of an expected arrival of McDowell is an erroneous theory, there having been no such expectation during the most of the time claimed to have been covered by this season of non-action.

Why this untenable theory should have been set up is not yet made clear. It must be left to further study, and perhaps to further explanations by the two generals. Many things concerning the campaign remain mysteries. The army was divided by the river from May 20 to June 27. The flood prevented the building of bridges to unite it (if the dispatches of McClellan told the truth), but the disclosures now made in the "Century" articles necessarily create great doubt whether those dispatches were true. Why should we be asked to believe the failure came from an attempt to protect supplies for McDowell, when they knew that general could not come? Why should we be asked to believe that McClellan stayed on the Chickahominy for that reason, when it was not possible for him to get away because of the rains and the destruction of the bridges?

Some other things, also, need to be accounted for. McClellan had been in front of Richmond for a month, and holding out a reasonable promise of being able to take it. Lincoln urged an advance while Jackson was in the Valley. According to Porter they did not fear Lee alone, but they did fear him united with Jackson.

They learn enough in the middle of June to excite suspicion that Jackson is coming, but yet they seem to have made no extra effort to get to Richmond before him. They must have known that if he had started on the 15th he would join Lee before the 24th. Yet McClellan makes his arrangement to move on the 26th. On the night of the 24th of June definite information arrives that Jackson is within two days' march of a junction. On the 25th McClellan is particularly hilarious. There can be no mistake about the date, because it was the day before the change to sadness, which was the day when Porter was attacked in force. One would naturally suppose that the knowledge of Jackson's approach received on the 24th would have made McClellan sad on the 25th ; but it seems not to have done so, or else it took a whole day to work him up to a realization of the danger.

On the 25th McClellan telegraphed Stanton : "I incline to think Jackson will attack my right and rear." That was a strange telegram under the circumstances. What inclined him to think so ? According to Porter they had been daily anxious about the condition. The right was weak and the base exposed. They were aware that Lee knew it, and, as a good general, that he would attack there if he made an attack at all. It was not likely he would make an attack in any weak fashion, and obviously McClellan must be prepared for the worst that Lee could do. Why does he say "incline to think" when he well knows Lee is going to do the proper thing for him to do ? Is it to leave an impression that in case of disaster he will be able to plead there was such doubt of Lee's intentions he dared not strengthen Porter ? But however this may be, he did not materially strengthen Porter and he did not withdraw him. He sent word to Stanton that the rebel army was reported at 200,000 men, and then he allowed Porter to meet as much of that force as Lee might see fit to precipitate upon him, and Porter had but 27,000 men ! He conceived the extraordinary idea that if Porter's little band could repel the assault of what Porter called the combined rebel army, the left wing would be able to go at once into Richmond ; and he resolved to stake the whole army on that notion, and, if Porter should be beaten, to burn up the enormous stores on the north of the river and fly in haste to Harrison's Landing on the James. Porter *was* beaten, and then McClellan discovered a way to get him across the river—the very thing which, for a month, he and Porter had seen *must* be done if

Lee did what they supposed he would do—struck the weak right wing with an overwhelming force.

Rebel General D. H. Hill now shows it would have been easy for McClellan to have captured Richmond while Lee was fighting Porter, but McClellan must be judged by what he knew at the time and not by what Hill knew. McClellan knew that an army divided by a river was in a bad position, and he knew that Lee at Gaines's Mill had placed the strongest portion of his army against the weakest portion of the Union army, and that the river was in the rear. This gave *him* the chance which Lee had all the time possessed down to June 26—the chance of throwing the strong wing against the weak one of the enemy; and yet he could not do what he gave Lee the credit of seeing was the right thing to do, and what he expected would be done—what indeed he saw was being done. Lee fought the McClellan weak wing; McClellan left Lee's weak unmolested.

Reference has been made to the persistency of the two generals in claiming they were bound to treat a suspended order as still in force because it had not been revoked in terms. This amazing loyalty to orders does not appear to have been a striking characteristic of these commanders on any other occasion; and when contrasted with the claims set up by them of the right and the duty of Porter to disobey the peremptory orders of Pope, because he imagined that Pope at the time of giving the orders did not understand the situation, makes it difficult to imagine that we are dealing with the same officers. They would have us think, in the one case, that an order which had been suspended for a month, and practically abandoned by sending McDowell where he could not come to them, must be treated as still in force, although at the peril of losing the campaign, while, in the other case, a positive and recent order was to be treated with direct contempt.

In an article by General Franklin in the July "Century," that officer says the Prince de Joinville requested him to tell General McClellan to concentrate his army at the junction of the two roads leading to Malvern Hill, to make a stand, and the next day he would be in Richmond. As Joinville was a man of ability, with a military education, and had been in the battle of Gaines's Mill on the staff of Porter, he was well able to judge in regard to the relative strength and fighting resources of the two armies. From what has been revealed since by Hill, there can be no question that Joinville was

right. Franklin did not tell McClellan, for two or three reasons, among them, and chief among them, because he knew McClellan had no intention to assume the aggressive, and was scrabbling toward the James with all his might.

There had been fighting every day since June 25, and General McClellan stated that he won every battle but the single one of Gaines's Mill. And yet he fled from every field! This singular conduct has not been explained on military principles. The presence of the Chickahominy no longer accounts for the situation, for that difficulty has been surmounted. The defense of the supplies on the Pamunkey has been abandoned. The weak right wing is no longer specially exposed. The ability to concentrate is recognized by the Frenchman, and has been demonstrated by Lee, whose forces, farther away and wider apart, *have* concentrated in spite of the river and the destruction of the bridges. But the victorious Union general concludes to escape the defeated foe and rest his laurels on the achievement of having saved his army!

AMERICA AND THE VATICAN.

IN March, 1884, the American Legation at Rome was cabled by the late Secretary of State Frelinghuysen to use every proper exertion on behalf of the Roman Propaganda to prevent the forced sale of one of its dependencies called the American College.

The secularizing of ecclesiastical property, in the conversion of monasteries and church lands to public uses, had been going on in all the provinces of Italy, excepting Rome, since 1862, under laws passed in 1861 and enlarged in 1867. In 1873 the operation of these laws was applied to the last fragment of the late temporal States of the Church. The constitutionality of these laws had been contested for ten years by the Propaganda before successive tribunals. The court of final appeal had recently rendered a decision ordering the enforcement of the law upon the property of the Propaganda. In substance, the laws passed by the Italian National Parliament provided for the conversion of lands belonging to the Roman Church in Italy into securities for the Italian government—an effective method of enlisting the pecuniary interest of an irreconcilable enemy in its permanence.

During the period of years from 1862 to 1884, no interposition had ever been made to prevent the “spoliation” of the church. Once only, and mainly at the instance of Mr. Gladstone’s government, had a mild remonstrance been made by several European states to preserve the beautiful Neapolitan Monastery of Monte Casino. The considerations urged were its antiquity, its architectural interest, and its historic value to travelers of all nations. As an amicable concession to the public opinion which prompted this species of archæological argument, Monte Casino has been left unmolested. But this was a voluntary concession, and not a recognition of any right; and the sensitiveness of both the Italian government and people in treating their conflict with the Vatican as

an internal question, in which none other had a word to say, had long made it apparent that any further interposition would be received with great disfavor. And when, in 1883, the British College of the Propaganda became threatened with "conversion," the British ambassador, Sir Augustus Paget, avowed his inability to interpose.

It was therefore with no sanguine anticipations that I presented myself to Signor Mancini, at that time Minister of Foreign Affairs. My personal relations with him were such as to obtain a courteous hearing of even so unwelcome a communication as that of the American government.

The first point to be attained was to "get the case into court"—to secure a hearing of the reasons which might be presented for exempting the College. In approaching the question, I treated it exclusively as one involving *American* property, and not at all as an interposition in favor of the Propaganda. I presented to him the claim to the title to the College as stated by those of the American Roman Catholic clergy who had first urged the subject upon the United States government: this, although vested in the Propaganda by Pius IX., as a gift upon the condition of a perpetual use for the training of priests for service in the United States, was claimed by the Catholic Church in America as property of the American people, on the ground that large sums had been from time to time contributed by American Catholic congregations, for the repair of the original building, for its maintenance for a period of a dozen years, and for the establishment in it of a library.

Signor Mancini admitted these rather unsubstantial claims to a title, and appointed an afternoon when he desired me to bring all the papers bearing upon the subject, when he would consider the matter fully, and see whether, as he expressed it, "*si può trovar un modo*"—a way can be found.

The Propaganda, apprised of the instruction of the Washington authorities, sent to the Legation a quantity of documents, and Monsignor Jacobini, Secretary of the Propaganda, the Vice-Rector of the American College, and the lawyer who had unsuccessfully contested the case before the Court of Appeals, recounted the successive phases of the legal defense to that time. Despite their recent defeat, these gentlemen were considerably elated at having transferred at least a portion of the question at issue to the channel of diplomacy, and declared success to be of extreme impor-

tance, as establishing a precedent of exemption upon which a claim for further concessions might later be based.

I became acquainted at this time with an English gentleman, who discharged with rare discretion the office of confidential diplomatic agent of the British government to the Vatican. In proof of the interest with which the solution of the pending negotiation was awaited, he told me that he had conferred with the representatives to the Vatican of the countries similarly interested, and that two of them were ready to support the government of the United States in making a protest. At the stage which the negotiations had then reached, and bearing as it did the character of an amicable request rather than that of an interposition, this action would evidently have done more harm than good. I therefore decided to proceed alone, while preparing, should the request of the American government prove insufficient, to propose to the representatives of several European powers at the Vatican Court to unite in a combined remonstrance, to save all those dependencies of the Propaganda which bear the names of the nationalities by which they have been founded or supported. Remembering the estrangements that characterized the last years of the reign of Pius IX., I was impressed during the incident with the improved relations which his successor has brought about, not only with the ultra-Catholic states of Austria and Spain, but with France and Germany, and, through confidential agents, with Great Britain and Russia.

In my second interview with Signor Mancini, I adhered to the first position of treating an American, not an Italian question. The following is an outline of the arguments which I presented to him at some length.

First, the consideration of equity : that the College had been given to the Propaganda by Pope Pius IX. years before the national occupation of Rome ; that it had been received with the intention of a perpetual use ; that upon the faith of this gift considerable sums had been expended upon it by American Catholics. Second, that as it was not intended, under the law, to sell the Propaganda itself, but only its property—such as leased houses and vineyards and farms—so, any building used for the purposes of the Propaganda, and subject to its discipline, should be regarded as materially part of the Propaganda, whether isolated or actually contiguous. And, lastly, I urged the favorable impression that such an act

of generosity would produce in the hearts of millions of American Catholics. The arguments which had served in the long defense before the Court of Appeals related to all the property of the Propaganda collectively, and were inapplicable specifically to the American College; and the documents were of little service beyond establishing the title, which was not in dispute, and as showing that the College had been largely supported by contributions from the United States, which was also conceded.

Signor Mancini showed an evident willingness to exempt the College, could a sufficient reason be found for so doing. "*Faremo tutto il nostro possibile per contentar' gli Americani,*" he laughingly remarked. The consideration of the "use" chiefly weighed with him, and he asked in connection with it whether I could obtain from the Propaganda a guaranty that, if exempted, the College should never be converted to any other purpose. This I engaged to do if required. On communicating this stipulation to the Propaganda authorities, it was at once assented to—perforce, perhaps; but as it was never reverted to by Signor Mancini, the obligation was not formally assumed.

In conclusion, Signor Mancini said that he would confer upon the subject with his colleague in the Cabinet, the Minister of Justice, in whose province the question lay, and it was also considered on the following Tuesday morning, at the usual Cabinet meeting over which the King presides. I doubted not that we should now advance through lengthy stages to a stay of proceedings in the proposed sale. I was greatly surprised and delighted when, calling at my residence a few days later, Signor Mancini showed me a letter from the Minister of Justice, stating that the reasons communicated were deemed sufficient to justify the exemption; but the letter was dated prior to my interview with Signor Mancini, that the concession might stand as one spontaneously made, and not in response to any influence or pressure. I immediately cabled the substance of this disposition to the State Department, and communicated it to the Propaganda.

At Washington so prompt a solution was unlooked for. The Italian Minister had verbally assured the State Department that his government would NEVER listen even to the statement of the case—would not even hear the question asked through the diplomatic channel whether the College might be spared. Possibly his declaration might have been justified had there been the semblance

of an intervention in Italian affairs, under the guise of an intercession in favor of the Propaganda. The State Department replied to me, "Your course in Propaganda matter is commended. Express President's thanks to Italian government.—Frelinghuysen."

The establishment by the Italian government of a precedent against itself attracted comment in the diplomatic corps at Rome, and to my amusement a number of my colleagues called to inquire, for the information of their respective governments, how this result had been obtained, as though some trick of sleight of hand had been performed. I invariably answered, after stating the considerations urged, that it had been the voluntary concession of the Italian government, induced solely by equity and by sentiments of national amity towards the American people.

Unfortunately, three weeks later Signor Mancini received from his representative at Washington cuttings from American Roman Catholic newspapers, wherein the concession was described as having been made under menace, together with injurious expressions relative to the "spoliation" of the church, and rejoicings that at length "the usurping House of Savoy" had been ordered to halt. It was difficult to palliate the offensiveness of these publications to Signor Mancini. "This is my return," he said, "for a voluntary act of kindness. The Mayor of Brooklyn holds a mass meeting at which resolutions denouncing the Italian government are adopted. Your clerical papers are allowed to publish that the exemption was made under a threat of war." I could only suggest to him that the United States government is not responsible for newspaper utterances, nor for resolutions adopted at a mass meeting. He conceded this point so far as concerned the intention of the government. "But," said he, laying his hand upon a particularly venomous article, which predicted that the "interposition" of the United States was but the prelude to such a crusade the world over as should restore to the Pope his own, "I tell you, that if ever it comes to more than words for the possession of Rome, which is the keystone of Italian unity, I, who am an old man, and thousands like me, will go out with a rifle with the young volunteers, and fight to maintain what has been achieved."

WILLIAM WALDORF ASTOR.

HOW TO QUELL MOBS.

Riots generally originate in crowded cities or in districts where the population is principally composed of operatives. They are due to two causes. First : the restlessness or peevish discontent of the working-classes, who imagine that others are reaping large gains from their labor. Second : the plotting of demagogues and designing men, too indolent to earn their bread by their own exertions, who hope to receive power and profit, or perhaps notoriety. A third cause may be mentioned : the desire of honest but misguided men to obtain a better position for themselves and their families, who, brooding over real or fancied wrongs, finally resort to unlawful measures for redress.

The actors in the first movements which finally lead to a riot rarely, if ever, imagine that they are inaugurating one of these ebullitions of popular fury.

A combination of workmen, who have banded together presumably for proper purposes, believing themselves to be imposed upon by their employers, take measures to secure what they consider their rights. Sometimes one, sometimes another method is adopted, either one of which finally leads to a breach between employers and employed. Then comes a strike. Perhaps the strikers are in the employ of a railroad company, which, with its connections, reaches across the continent : all operations are suspended upon the railroad ; passenger and freight cars are stopped upon the tracks ; each individual striker has a little circle which he influences ; the circumferences of these circles touch each other, and thus commotion is spread through the land. Human sympathy always goes out to the oppressed ; the strikers represent themselves as oppressed by the monopolizing corporations, and the sympathy of the community for the weaker unites with its natural prejudice against the stronger in the contest ; disorder begins ; confusion

becomes worse confounded. Now appear the baser elements of society—the tramp, the thief, the rogue, the burglar—and these elements, which before were the outcasts of society, now become the rulers of the hour. The quarrel, before confined to the railroad and its employés, now enlarges its field, and the bad is arrayed against the general good. Pillagers at first despoil the railroad company, and then seek the property of others, no matter whom, to satisfy their greed. The community awakes to the danger of the situation, but it is too late; anarchy has the upper hand, and vice and lawlessness reign supreme.

Or perhaps the general government, in a time of exigency, using an undisputed right, enacts an obnoxious law: mutterings of discontent are heard; the demagogue or the ambitious man, seizing the opportunity, foment the public agitation. From a simple disturber, he becomes a leader of the mob and attempts to rule the storm, always having in view, however, his own personal ends. But, to rule, he must unite the masses in a grand struggle for relief from a grievance, real or imaginary. Again the passions of the mob are excited, and there peep from out their hiding-places scoundrels who never before dared face the light of day. These wretches, by their presence and active efforts, add to the fury of the rioters—not to redress their own wrongs or the wrongs of others, but in the hope of plunder and for the gratification of their baser passions—and scenes of anarchy, ravage, and arson, like whirlwinds, sweep over the country.

Or, looking in the faces of their wives and children, and upon their abodes, and finding a lack of the ordinary comforts of civilized life, a number band together, hoping by the strength of union to secure those comforts for themselves and their families. They use no improper means at first; they intend to use none. The mere desire to better their condition develops in time into a disregard for law, a contempt for order, and a trampling upon the rights of others; they are carried away in their excitement by aspirations which they would not have entertained in their cooler moments; the circle of discontent increases; others seeking redress for imaginary wrongs join in the contest. Numbers add to the turbulence, and again scoundrels and rascals appear, until at last the same scenes are enacted as before described, and riot rules the land.

These are no imaginary scenes. They have been enacted again

and again in this country, and under similar circumstances will be repeated. Public and private property to the value of millions of dollars has been destroyed, and precious lives have been sacrificed in only one such turbulent uprising.

“How shall the future riot be suppressed? Upon whom lies the duty of suppression—upon the general government, the State, or the municipality?”

These are the practical questions to be discussed.

The general government has no power, except such as is derived by cession from the States. It is the creature of the State governments, and in its relations with the States is governed by organic law, beyond which it cannot step. Like all general rules, there is an exception to this rule; for there is a law, not to be found in any written constitution, which must from necessity control the general government, and that is the law of self-preservation. While it cannot interfere in any of the municipal regulations of the States, still there may be an exigency when it is not only its right, but its duty to interfere. Whenever the property of the government is endangered by an unlawful assemblage of persons, the government should protect its property, even with the sacrifice of life. It can make no difference where that property is situated. It is not subject to the laws of the States; no taxes are paid to the State for its protection.

To illustrate: During the late Rebellion, a draft became necessary to fill up the army of the Union. The President, in pursuance of an act of Congress, had ordered it, but the draft could not be made under the immediate direction of the general government; it must be made under the supervision of the State authorities. The draft, like all general laws, imposed hardships, and in some localities was resisted—especially in the city of New York—and from one step to another the resistance culminated in a riot, one of the most disgraceful ever known in this country. Houses were pillaged, orphan asylums were burned, innocent men were hung to lamp-posts, and for days, in this great city, scenes of anarchy and bloodshed were enacted, at the mention of which to-day every citizen of this great metropolis should shudder with horror. But the United States Government had no right to interfere, although the draft was for its benefit—to replenish its armies, fighting for the restoration of the Union. The draft was made under the immediate direction of the State. No officer of the govern-

ment, from the President down, could act, except when called upon by the State authorities. But the call of the President must be obeyed, and the duty of suppressing the riot rested upon the State and municipal authorities. If the rioters had attacked any property of the government, however, then it would clearly have been the duty of the general government to protect that property. Indubitably, the State officials could have called upon the general government for aid in an emergency, as in some cases they did ; but until such call was made the government had no right to interfere. The rights of the States, so sharply defined, precluded the idea of any interference from the general government ; but those very rights threw on the State and the municipality the responsibility of suppressing the riot—the rights claimed and the responsibilities were proportionate and inseparable.

It might become the duty of the government to suppress a riot in order to enforce an act of Congress with a penalty attached, where the duty of enforcing that act rested with the United States or its officers. True, it is the duty of the State to protect its citizens ; but in this case the cause of the riot is resistance to an attempt on the part of the general government to enforce its laws—its officers are defied, its laws set at naught, and its dignity compromised. It would be of little use for Congress to make laws, if those laws could be abrogated by the turbulence of lawless men. If the government could not enforce its enactments, then its laws would be mere nullities.

With these two exceptions, it is believed that the duty of suppressing riots rests upon the State and municipality. The highest duty devolving upon a government is the protection of the lives and property of its citizens. Taxes are levied by the State and paid by the citizen for this protection, and neither State nor municipality can escape the responsibility. The duty of suppression rests, first, with the municipality. The municipality failing, then the State is bound to render assistance.

The legislatures of the different States have enacted laws for the punishment of rioters ; but these laws only apply to the punishment of rioters as such, and do not reach the real trouble in the case. It is true that laws may be passed making it a penal offense for persons to meet together for the purpose of beginning a riot, for inciting a riot, for conspiring to bring about a riot ; but no law can be passed preventing citizens from demanding in a

peaceable manner the enforcement of rights, or what they believe to be their rights. No law can operate against the formation of societies by working men whose object would be simply to better the condition of its members. What is necessary is the adoption of measures creating such a condition of things that a riot will be impossible. An ounce of prevention, in this case, is worth many pounds of cure.

It is very difficult to draw the line where forbearance shall cease to be a virtue, and where stern duty compels the authorities to use coercion. All this must be left to their good sense, alert judgment, and proper appreciation of each individual case. There should be no dallying with a mob. It is hydra-headed, many-sided, and, at the outset, undecided as to its future movements; but if, without the use of decided measures for prevention, it be suffered to take its own way, a leader will soon be found of sufficient capacity to direct and control these movements. Let this period once be passed, and let a master-mind be placed in command, with subservience on the part of his followers, and the control of the mob in the right direction is forever lost.

When then is the decisive moment at which the blow must be struck? The solution of this problem depends not upon any argument, but upon an instantaneous grasping of the facts and necessities of the case and of the steps necessary to be taken, and prompt action upon the decision of the moment. A howling, surging mob may be scattered in an instant by the use of discreet measures; but a mob actuated by one ruling motive, organized and directed by one master mind, can no more be controlled by human influence, outside of itself, than can the Falls of Niagara be dammed with straw.

The qualities most needed, in those who are charged with the duty of preventing riots, are coolness, decision, alertness, and courage. Let the mob once ascertain that any of these qualities are wanting in those who seek to suppress, and the opportunity for suppression is lost. It would have been more merciful in the end to those composing many mobs, certainly to those who suffered from their excesses, if instead of firing blank cartridges a few bullets had found their way into the muskets. One determined man, with fearless front and undaunted courage, has been of more service in preventing a riot than scores of dilly-dallying mayors and governors who read the riot act and begged and

besought the rioters to disperse, and called them by endearing names.

In 1877 riots broke out all over the land. The history of these riots reveals strange inconsistencies and many shameful derelictions of duty. In the city of Pittsburg, with the police of the city at his back, and a large number of State troops at his command, the mayor of that great town, with an indecision which was indefensible and unaccountable (except upon the supposition that by so doing he hoped to preserve his popularity), suffered anarchy and pillage and murder to rule for days. He strove to stem a torrent of turbulence and violence with soft speeches, by reading the riot act, by kind words. But it was too late. The time for such formalities had passed. The sacrifice of a few lives by charges of fixed bayonets, or by salvos of musketry charged with bullets, would have scattered the howling, demoniac mob back to the holes and dreary retreats from which so many of them had come.

At Harrisburg, the same policy at first placed the troops of the great State of Pennsylvania, sent to relieve its capital from the depredations of the mob, prisoners in the hands of that very mob that they were sent to suppress. The militiamen were marched up and down the streets amid the jeers and howls of the rioters. But a different state of affairs was soon inaugurated, through the exertions of one determined man, the mayor of the city. He selected some of the best citizens, and with the sheriff of the county marched at their head, and almost in an instant dispelled the mob while in the very act of pillaging.

All along the line of the railroads extending west from Buffalo the employés were in commotion. Mobs of several thousand people had gathered at different points, but only at one place was the mob beyond the control of the authorities. This was at the city of Buffalo. At East Buffalo, where a mob which was estimated at more than three thousand persons was hooting, howling, and threatening vengeance, a captain of police, with the aid of the baton forcibly brought in contact with the heads of the rioters, in a very few moments dispelled the mob, so that, in the words of the historian who records this incident, "the East Buffalo grounds were as clear and quiet as a country field on a Sunday afternoon."

No other town in the great State of New York, except Buffalo, was seriously incommoded at this eventful period in the history of the riots of this country; and this was due to the determined action

taken by the authorities, and to the splendid organization of the State militia, aided by a well-conducted police force. Other States were at the mercy of mobs, but New York was free.

In New Jersey, when the late Theodore F. Randolph was governor, a remarkable instance was exhibited of what wise policy and determined action on the part of the executive of a State could accomplish. A riot was threatened, arising from the old grudge, long existing, between the different Irish factions—the Orangemen and the Catholics. Citizens went to bed at night quaking and quivering with fear. A few quick military preparations to quell the expected turbulence, a determined proclamation, with stern warning of punishment if the law were broken, and quiet was restored as if by magic. If the same policy of prevention had been pursued all over the country during the riots of 1877, an effectual stop would have been put to violence, property of incalculable value would have been saved, and lives valuable to the community would have been preserved.

Mobs are cowards at first. Crime always enervates. They only gain courage as they find that those whose duty it is to suppress them are themselves cowards. A mob is not to be feared when it is first aroused. It is only as its passion for carnage is whetted by the taste of blood, or its greed for pillage is gratified, that it becomes dangerous.

Upon whomsoever devolves the duty of suppression, let this be his first effort: check at the very beginning; allow no tumultuous gatherings; permit no delay; a few stern, resolute words; if these be not heeded, then strike resolutely, boldly; let there be no hesitation; if necessary, take life at the outset. It will be more merciful to take one life than to suffer the mob to take the lives of many, or to be compelled to sacrifice the innocent with the guilty at the point of the bayonet, or in the discharge of musketry or cannon. But the necessity to take life will not arise unless there be inactivity and indecision at the outset on the part of the authorities.

Before the time shall come when it will be necessary to use musket-ball or bayonet, the opportunity will be afforded to suppress the riot; perhaps at the sacrifice of a few broken heads, or by the imprisonment of some of its leaders.

In every large city, in fact in every city where a police force is employed, a perfect drill should prepare policemen to meet the

exigencies arising from any tumultuous assemblage of the people ; so that, at a moment's warning, these conservators of the peace will be ready to act, and to act understandingly and promptly. It will be found that a few determined policemen, placed in the field at a moment's notice, will prove one of the best and most direct methods of quelling a mob. These, by skillful maneuvers, can take a mob in flank, or in rear, or in front, if necessary, and so employ themselves and their clubs that almost before the mob would know what was impelling them they would be driven from the field of action. This drilling, advised to be used with policemen, can also be used to excellent advantage with the militia of every State, so that in case of emergency they can be used with as good effect as policemen. It has often been found, in the history of the riots of this country, that when the soldiery have been brought in the face of a mob, even the officers were so unacquainted with their duties as to evince the most ridiculous ignorance of what was required of them and of their men in the exigency ; and they and their troops have been driven ignominiously from the field. They would have known what to do, without hesitation, had they been in the face of an enemy ; but, surrounded as they were by a frantic mob, they failed—and for lack of the necessary drilling.

In the draft riot of 1863, after the mob had had full possession of the city of New York for several days, and the United States troops had been called in with little or no effect, and the State militia had failed, the police of the city, by their bold, brave, and indefatigable action, quelled the riot and prevented any further disorder. It was a remarkable instance of what can be done by a drilled organization. Since that time no riot could by any possibility have occurred in that great city. The police force of New York are ready to act in any emergency ; and it is very doubtful whether it would be necessary to call in the aid of the State troops, or of the United States forces, in case a riot were threatened. Governor Seymour, in a proclamation made just after this riot, gave due credit to the police force, fully appreciating their magnificent services. Let it be known, in every large town and city throughout the land, that the police force is constantly under control and discipline, ready promptly to perform its whole duty in case of any riotous action, and there will be an end of these turbulent assemblages.

The most fertile cause of all riots is the peevish discontent of

wage-workers—too often ignorant of the true relations between themselves and their employers. This peevish discontent may perhaps be confined to a few, but those few will be able to avail themselves of the restlessness which may pervade the whole body of operatives. This discontent arises not so much from any real oppression, or from any wrong, but simply from the natural jealousy which every man feels, more or less, when he sees others living more luxuriously than himself, and especially when that luxury appears to be the result of his labor. Now this discontent may be dispelled, perhaps not in the present generation, though it may be greatly moderated ; but, certainly, means can be taken to prevent it in the future. The employer and employé may surely be brought together in more intimate relations than those they at present sustain. Where lies the fault in the present system ? Who is justly chargeable with the origin of this discontent ? That question cannot be settled in this discussion. But so much may be said : the working-classes can be educated up to a higher tone of feeling, a better appreciation of their duty to their employers, a higher standard of morals, and a nobler level of thought and action. May not the employers find something in the present condition of things for which they are responsible; and which they, in the exercise of the duty they owe to common humanity, may be able to better ?

There is a factory, in one of the large manufacturing towns of the country, where one of the employers, imbued with true Christian philanthropy, brings himself, in a measure, down to a level with his hundreds of employés. He mingles with their families ; finds out the social status and wants of all ; gives a word of advice to one ; imparts counsel to another ; sympathizes with the mourner ; puts his strong arm round the weak ; and employs all of his ability to raise his workingmen in the scale of human existence. He provides a reading-room for them, furnishes them with reading matter, and gives them lectures. Let this example be emulated by every employer in the land, and riots would be impossible.

The legislators of the country, with a “penny wise and pound foolish” spirit, have neglected this their highest duty—the enactment of wise and judicious laws to provide for the many-sided interests of the employers and the employed. Demagogues invade legislative halls, and, with the hope of rising upon the wave of

popularity, cater to the worst passions of their constituents. Many, imagining that the source of popularity lies with one class or with another, forget everything but their own selfish, groveling aims, and cater to the passions of that class.

The history of the legislation of the country, unfortunately, is full of the evidences of this ignoble spirit. The true legislator, rising equal to his position, surveys the whole field and legislates for all—not for a class. In the near future it is quite evident that there is a contest imminent between labor and capital. The true law-maker may avert that contest—the false may hasten it.

FITZ JOHN PORTER.

RECOLLECTIONS AND LETTERS OF GRANT.

PART I.

MY early recollections of General Grant extend from the time he was six or seven years of age, in 1828, or one year later, to the autumn of 1836. During that time we lived within three hundred yards of each other in the small village of Georgetown, the county seat of Brown County, Ohio. From proximity, and perhaps from other causes, our association was intimate. When we were so small that we had the belief that in a much-swollen stream there must be a superabundance of fish, we were engaged with hook and line in an attempt to catch them. He ventured out on a barked poplar log, very slippery from the rain; in an instant his feet were in the air, and he disappeared in the turbulent, muddy water. I rushed down the stream some thirty feet, where it narrowed, and willows partly undermined bent over the stream nearly to the surface of the water. Out upon one of these willows I clambered quickly, and grabbing my young companion as he was borne down by the swift current, helped him to reach the bank. It is not unlikely that this incident would have been entirely forgotten by me had he not worn at that time a Marseilles upper garment with red stripes, buttoning on the nether garment, as worn by children. It seemed to me so superb, that I was filled with regret that it should thus be irretrievably ruined. In the following pages a letter from General Grant, when at Nice, will be quoted, which alludes to this incident.

His mother at that time was perhaps thirty years of age, above medium height, graceful in manner, gracious to children, neat in person, and kept her children neatly clothed, which was rather unusual in that part of the world at that time. In after years the General told me that he had never seen his mother shed a tear; she had a cheerful countenance, a kind word to all, and in my eyes was very handsome, and, in reality, certainly was at least very prepossessing and agreeable.

As a boy, General Grant was never aggressive nor given to profanity, a vice that was not unusual with many of his companions. If provoked or insulted he would fight it out manfully. He never entered into a fight without it being clearly the fault of the other boy. He was fond of horses ; we rode usually without a saddle, a blanket being strapped on the back of the horse, and without stirrups. In childhood he was a sturdy little fellow, never boisterous. Without being slothful or inert, he had not that superabundant flow of animal spirits which impels many boys to "stand on their heads," yell vociferously, and do many disagreeable things from thoughtlessness, apparently arising from great vitality.

A small brick school-house stood on a hill some three hundred yards from the court-house, near which we lived. It had two rooms, the one for the girls, the other for the boys.

Writing from Pau, France, General Grant says of this period of our lives :

"PAU, FRANCE, *December 6, 1878.*

"MY DEAR ADMIRAL :

"On my arrival here last night I found a very large mail, and in it two letters from you. This is the first mail since leaving Gibraltar, from whence I wrote you. At that time I had fully determined not to go by India, China, and Japan, and so wrote the Secretary of the Navy—saying, however, that if I determined otherwise before the departure of the 'Richmond' from America, I would cable him. This morning I sent him a dispatch that I would accept his offer of a passage on that steamer. I could not say much in a dispatch, but I hope we will be able to join the steamer on the north side of the Mediterranean, somewhere between Marseilles and Palermo. This will extend my trip and make my arrival in America some months later than I had expected, probably extending the time into late fall. Of course, going by San Francisco, I shall want to spend at least a month going over old ground with which I was familiar a quarter of a century ago. That quarter of a century does not seem half so long as the one which preceded it, and passed since you and I first received instruction under John D. White and a long beech switch cut generally by the boys for their own chastisement.

"Mrs. Grant wants me to say now that she regrets your retirement, because you might [otherwise] accompany us, and she has every confidence in you on your native element. I believe you are a first-class farmer besides.

"I have not yet received your paper on the 'interoceanic canal,' but will read it with great interest when it reaches me.

"I had preserved with great care a letter you wrote me as much as nine months ago, giving the route and places to visit on naval vessels after leaving the Red Sea, until since leaving Gibraltar; but I destroyed it a few days ago. I would be very glad to get a repetition of it now.

"I am very sorry, with Mrs. Grant, that you cannot be the commander on our proposed trip, and that Mrs. Ammen is not to be with us. . . ."

I left that locality in November, 1836, and did not meet my old companion again until June, 1843. He had just graduated at the Military Academy, and, passing through Philadelphia, had kindly arranged a meeting at Jones' Hotel, near Seventh, on Chestnut street, Philadelphia. He was then a stoutly built, round-faced youth, twenty-one years of age on the 27th of the preceding April. Our next meeting was at Culpepper Court House, Virginia, where I went on the 1st of May, 1864, just as he was on the point of crossing the Rapidan. He had been at Hampton Roads some weeks before, and, speaking with Admiral Lee, expressed a desire to see me at head-quarters. I was then at Norfolk on a court of inquiry. Previous to this I had shown the admiral a letter which I had received in reply to one of my own. It has never appeared in print, and will be read with interest :

"NASHVILLE, TENN., *February 16, 1864.*

"DEAR AMMEN :

"Your letter was duly received and advice fully appreciated, particularly as it is the same I would give any friend ; *i. e.*, to avoid all political entanglements. I have always thought the most slavish life any man could lead was that of a politician. Besides, I do not believe any man can be successful as a soldier whilst he has an anchor ahead for other advancement. I know of no circumstances likely to arise which could induce me to accept of any political office whatever. My only desire will be, as it has been, to whip out the rebellion in the shortest way possible, and to retain as high a position in the army afterward as the Administration then in power may think me suitable for.

"I was truly glad to hear from you. I was once on leave of absence at the same time you were, and went from Clermont County to Cincinnati more to see you than for any other purpose. When I got there, found you had gone to Ripley by river. I believe the last time we met was in Philadelphia, in 1843. We have both grown older since, though time sets very lightly with me. I am neither gray nor bald, nor do I feel any different from what I did at twenty-five. I have often wished you had been selected to command the Mississippi flotilla. I have no fault to find, however, with the naval officers who have co-operated with me. I think Porter, Phelps, and some of the younger officers, as clever men as I ever fell in with. I cannot complain of them, certainly, for I believe I never made a request of them they did not comply with, no matter what the danger. I know I caused Porter to lose one gunboat against his judgment, and he never found fault.

"Remember me to Mrs. Vandyke's family, and any other friends of mine in Cincinnati. I will be very glad to hear from you again.

"Yours truly,

"U. S. GRANT."

The opportunity to visit General Grant occurred on being detached from the temporary command of a vessel. A note stating

my desire to pay him a visit, if it suited his convenience, was followed by the receipt of the requisite military pass. On my arrival at Culpepper the General received me very kindly, reminded me that it was nearly twenty-one years since we had met at Philadelphia, and turned me over to Colonel Badeau, who was an old acquaintance, and suggested that we should take a ride. We were soon mounted, and, accompanied by several other officers, rode to the summit of Pony Hill, some three miles distant to the south-west, from whence we could see the field-works of the enemy across the Rappahannock.

About ten o'clock, the hour the General informed me he would be at leisure, he sent for me. We were alone until some time after midnight. He spoke of our boyhood, of the persons whom we knew in common, and, later, concerning army movements. Not an inconsiderable object of my visit, although not at all official, was to assure an effective co-operation of our naval forces. I had been authorized by Admiral Lee to say to the General that, apart from the force requisite for the maintenance of the blockade on the coast of North Carolina, all other vessels under his command would be subordinated, as far as desired, to support army movements in any manner suggested.

Breakfasting with the General and his staff the following morning, he proposed a ride with me. We were accompanied by one orderly. The course chosen was first to the north-east, and after some miles passed over, turning to the right. The country was an undulating plain, almost denuded of wood and wholly destitute of fences. Here and there were encamped the different army corps that composed a principal part of the force that was about to cross the Rappahannock. The General rode the finest horse, as he told me then and afterwards, that he had ever mounted—a large, powerful bay, with a free, easy stride of great scope. This horse was the half-brother of the famous “Lexington,” and was named “Cincinnati.” The General spoke of his intended movement, that our army in the valley was already on the march, and told me that on the following day, as I returned to Washington, I would meet Burnside’s corps. He did not feel at liberty to give the number of troops that would move on Richmond. The force, however, was as large as he thought himself able to command, bearing in mind the difficulties of the country for transportation. Were the troops with their supply trains to be placed along the line of road to Richmond, which I

think he gave as seventy miles, the head of the army would be at Richmond before the rear had crossed the Rapidan. He added humorously that he did not expect to reach Richmond in that order.

In reply to my inquiry, he said that he supposed that he had very reliable information of the forces of General Lee. As I remember, he reckoned them at 120,000 men, including the militia or local forces in Richmond and Petersburg. He did not regard General Lee as the ablest general of the South; he, however, possessed the entire confidence, respect, and indeed affection of every one under his command, and such a man could not be an indifferent commander to meet. He considered General Joseph E. Johnston as a superior and very able commander, and Bragg, if regarded simply in the light of a soldier, he thought very able; he was, however, so thoroughly detested by the people of the South that he would never prove a formidable adversary.

After a ride of some two hours or more, passing over probably twelve or fifteen miles, we approached Culpepper from the general direction of Pony Hill. As we passed another army corps, the General remarked, with something in manner akin to enthusiasm, that there was the most thoroughly equipped army for field-work that he thought could be found on the globe. He would do the best he could with it. Newspapers state that officers have said, Give me this or that number of troops, and they would do this or that; but he could only promise to do his best. He said, further, that some of our officers, after an engagement, thought it impossible to move on until they were again thoroughly prepared, apparently forgetful that the enemy was making the best use of his time also. The result of an engagement was often only a question of relative exhaustion of resources; if the enemy's forces were worse off than his own, as the result of a battle, he saw no reason why the enemy should not be pressed at once, notwithstanding actual deficiencies of his own preparation.

Two or three days after I left the General he crossed the Rapidan, and I had not the pleasure of meeting him again until the evening of the day of the review of General Sherman's army in Washington, after the close of the war. He wrote me from City Point, August 18th, 1864, principally in relation to the explosion of the mine of Petersburg. Shortly after that date I saw a published letter from him to some one else very similar in import, and indeed

in some parts almost identical in words. The following extracts will probably interest the reader :

“Several times we have had decisive victories within our grasp, but let them, through accident or fault, slip through our hands. Our movement from Cold Harbor to the south side of the James was made with such celerity, that before the enemy got a single regiment across the river our forces had carried the fortifications east of Petersburg. There was nothing, not even a military force, to prevent our walking in and taking possession. The officer charged with this work, for some unaccountable reason, stopped at the works he had captured, and gave the enemy time to get in a garrison and to intrench it. On the 30th of July, again by a feint north of the James, we drew most of the enemy to that side of the river, and whilst he was there (with my troops quietly withdrawn during the night) a mine, judiciously prepared, was exploded, burying a battery and some three hundred of the enemy, and making a breach in his works into which our men marched without opposition. The enemy was completely surprised, and commenced running in all directions. There was nothing to prevent our men from marching directly to the high ground in front of them, to which they had been directed to go. Once there, all the enemy's fortifications would have been taken in reverse, and no stand would have been made. It is clear that without a loss of five hundred men we could have had Petersburg with all its artillery and many of the garrison. But our troops stopped in the crater made by the explosion. The enemy was given time to rally and re-occupy his line. Then we found, true enough, that we had the wolf by the ears. He was hard to hold, and more dangerous to let go. This was so outrageous that I have obtained a court of inquiry to sift the matter. We will peg away, however, and end this matter if our people at home will but be true to themselves. If they would but reflect, everything looks favorable. . . .

“The hope of a counter-revolution over the draft or the Presidential election keeps them together. Then, too, they hope for the election of a ‘peace candidate,’ who would let them go. ‘A peace at any price’ is fearful to contemplate. It would be but the beginning of war. The demands of the South would know no limits. They would demand indemnity for expenses incurred in carrying on the war. They would demand the return of all their

slaves set free in consequence of war. They would demand a treaty looking to the rendition of all fugitive slaves escaping into the Northern States, and they would keep on demanding until it would be better to be dead than to submit longer. . . ."

During the winter of 1865-66 General Grant was domiciled in Washington. My duties at that time were at that navy-yard, in command of a vessel of war. I saw him there almost daily. We had an idea in common—that the narrow parts of the American continent should be sufficiently examined to ascertain the practicability of a ship canal from sea to sea, or the reverse. Rear-Admiral Davis, then Superintendent of the Naval Observatory, had an old Spanish map of that region enlarged, with coast lines put in with the best geographical determinations. After many examinations of this and such other information as was readily obtainable, General Grant paid a visit to the Secretary of State several times, on one occasion taking me with him. Finally, he told me that he would not go to see Mr. Seward again in relation to this matter; he felt satisfied, should he do so, that he would hate Mr. Seward, and he was not disposed to put himself into a position to make him hate any man.

After taking leave of Washington, in April, I did not see General Grant until the famous "swinging around the circle" of President Johnson, accompanied by himself and Admiral Farragut, passing through York, Pennsylvania, where I then lived. General Grant kindly sent me a telegram to meet him on the car, when he expressed to me very freely his disgust at this tour, which was no less distasteful to Admiral Farragut than to himself.

In the summer and autumn of 1867 my duties again took me to Washington for short periods, at which times I was usually an inmate of General Grant's house. On one of these occasions, not long after the forced resignation or dismissal of Mr. Stanton from the position of Secretary of War, General Grant informed me that, much against his inclination, he had consented to accept the position of Acting Secretary of War, a controlling reason being, that he feared the President might otherwise appoint some unscrupulous person, whose approval, under existing laws, of fraudulent cotton claims, might rob the treasury of \$200,000,000, or even more. Perhaps the following morning, certainly within a day or so, General Sherman, then stationed at St. Louis, made his appearance in General Grant's house at a very early hour. As soon as

General Grant dressed he came down-stairs, and in a humorous way said : " Why, Sherman, what on earth are you doing here ? You know very well that, under existing laws, you cannot leave St. Louis without my order." " Oh, yes," said Sherman, with a merry twinkle in his eye, " I know that very well ; but the President sent me a telegram to come on, and I am here to see you to know what is up. I rely greatly on your clemency in violating the law." I have never made inquiry since then, of General Grant or of General Sherman, of what " was up " at that time.

Later in the season, when from time to time I was in Washington, General Grant kindly invited me to a drive with him in his buggy, and expressed at times great distrust of the intentions or rather designs of Mr. Johnson. In the autumn, on one of these drives, he said he felt sure that nothing but the cowardice of the President stood in the way of very serious events. He had become aware of a secret military organization in Maryland, and had accurate information at that time of its ramifications, through General —. The Governor of Maryland had made requisitions on the War Department for field artillery to which, under existing laws, the State was entitled ; but knowing as he did the intended revolutionary purpose, he had simply pigeon-holed the requisitions. For a time he thought of writing the Governor that he had his eye on him, but on the whole he concluded not to do so. In Virginia, too, there were signs of a support, but so far no organization existed ; the intention was inchoate in development. Farther south there were no indications of disturbance.

Early in December my duties brought me again to Washington for a day. Meeting General Grant near the War Department, he invited me to his room. Seeing that he had a careworn look, I asked him how matters were progressing. He said, " Badly enough ; I will not be surprised at anything that may occur. Within a few days the President paid me a visit of an hour or more, speaking on indifferent subjects, and, just before leaving, said : ' General, there is one point upon which I feel a deep interest, and that is, in the event of an open rupture between Congress and myself, where will you be found ? ' The reply was," said the General to me with great earnestness : " ' That will depend entirely upon which was the revolutionary party.' "

I dined with the General that day, and he was good enough to drive me to the railroad depot when I was leaving the city. Be-

fore we parted he expressed his regret that thus far he had not been able to forward the examination of the isthmuses, for the purpose of ascertaining the practicability of a ship canal. I replied, "That makes little difference, General; I feel assured that sooner or later you will be able to bring this about." In a few days I was at sea for the Asiatic station.

I returned to the United States in April, 1869. The General was good enough to request that I should be ordered home, after his election to the Presidency in November, 1868. I find in my package only two letters from him during my absence. One, dated November 23, contains the following :

"DEAR AMMEN :

"Your welcome and very interesting letters up to September have been received. . . . Appearances now are about what they were in '65. I would write you a long letter on public and home affairs but that I hope you will be on your way home soon after the receipt of this, if you are not before. . . ."

Upon my arrival in Washington I was assigned to duty, and remained in that city during the two Presidential terms of General Grant. My residence being in the country, General Grant was good enough to give me a general invitation to dine with him on Sunday when it suited my convenience. This I did monthly, more frequently twice a month, and usually before dinner took a walk with him, at times five or six miles in length, and rarely less than half that distance. He spoke freely on many matters upon which he is supposed to have been silent. In all my intercourse with him I have no recollection of his uttering what seemed an ill-digested expression; he was a man essentially of ideas. With me and with others by whom he would not be misunderstood, or his language repeated and afterwards perverted, he was not at all a "silent man." Although I have no recollection of his ever saying to me that he did not wish publicity to be given to what he had said, yet on many occasions I felt that I would have betrayed an implied confidence, as in the case of what has been stated above in regard to the Governor of Maryland, and of his conversation with President Johnson. In the White House, Johnson was spoken of on one occasion. I expressed some surprise that it had not found its way into the newspapers preceding the Presidential election. He said it did not, simply because he had never mentioned it, except to General Comstock and myself.

Soon after he became President I asked what he thought was the political effect of the assassination of President Lincoln. He replied, with great feeling, that it was the greatest possible calamity to the country, and especially to the people of the South. Had Mr. Lincoln lived, his great ability and tact would, he thought, have very soon reconciled and adjusted all possible differences, and the country would have been spared long years of mismanagement and misunderstanding.

On one of our Sunday walks we met two gentlemen, one of whom introduced the other to the General. The one introduced told the General that he knew him when he kept Knight's Ferry, near Stockton, in California. The General smiled, and replied that he had met a great number of people who told him they knew him when he kept that ferry. We passed on, and our conversation was resumed without any comment in relation to these gentlemen or what had been said. Had any one asked me whether General Grant had kept that ferry, I certainly would have replied affirmatively. On the return of General Grant, after his tour around the world, he visited Stockton in the autumn of 1879, and in a short, humorous address said that he had met hundreds, perhaps thousands, of people who had told him they knew him when he kept the ferry near that city. There must be some mistake about it, nevertheless, he said, as he had never visited that locality but once before, and on that occasion had staid over night only.

The Presidency gave him great annoyance. On one occasion he said to me that if he knew capable, honest men in Louisiana, who would accept office, he would appoint them, whether Republicans or Democrats. Being Democrats did not in his belief make them honest, and therefore he had not gone out of his party. I said that a native of Louisiana, and at that time a resident, had told me that he did not think there was any political honesty in that State in either party.

I feel quite sure that General Grant would have felt greatly relieved had he never been proposed for the Presidency. After his election for a second term he said that he felt gratified at a re-nomination, as it indicated an approval of his first term. During his army service, nor at any other time, had he ever solicited, directly or indirectly, military or civil preferment. I feel warranted in expressing the belief that at the period when his political friends insisted upon his candidacy for a third term he would have felt

grateful to them had they proposed any other person who would have been generally acceptable.

During his Presidency he took great personal interest in the progress of all of the surveys touching the practicability of an interoceanic canal across this continent, and when these surveys eliminated from commercial consideration the different proposed routes other than Nicaragua and Panama, he directed a close instrumental survey of the latter when informed by the Canal Commission, appointed by him under a Congressional resolution, that this survey was essential to a relative consideration of the merits of the two routes. When these surveys were completed he carefully examined the results, and fully agreed with the Commission that the Nicaragua route so far surpassed the Panama in economic conditions of construction and in other commercial advantages as to settle beyond a doubt the question of where the canal should and ultimately will be, as extracts from letters written by him abroad will show in the pages following.

During all the years of his Presidency I was most kindly, I may say affectionately, received at the White House, and was there at such times as he had his recreations. His table was supplied with the wines usual with persons of position. During the earlier years of his administration he partook, but not at all freely, of what he furnished his guests. The winter preceding the expiration of his last term he was actually abstinent at his own table, and, I have every reason to believe, entirely so. Yet during that period one or more of the Washington Sunday newspapers, and other vile prints, informed the people of the disgrace they were suffering because of their besotted President, who was to be seen daily reeling through the streets! During all of these years I never saw General Grant in a condition that would give rise even to a suspicion that he had indulged too freely in liquors, and only on one occasion have I ever had a glass of liquor in the White House. On one of the many Sundays that General Grant invited me to walk before dinner, the weather was raw and the wind high. On coming into the house the General proposed a glass of liquor, and, going into the dining-room, we were waited on by the steward. Many of the friends and admirers of General Grant will read this statement with gratification, and the more if they know me personally. They will at least feel assured that I would not present even a specious statement, much less an untruth, however much I might feel interested

in the good name of any one. May not the gentlemen of the press well consider whether it would not be far better to do justice to the living than to adulate the dead? Adulation then cannot recompense the wronged, nor can "flattery soothe the dull, cold ear of death."

Soon after the expiration of his last term, in April, 1877, General Grant kindly asked me to accompany him to Ohio, to visit the home of our childhood. At Cincinnati we were the guests of Washington McLean, Esq., a gentleman properly known far and wide. From thence the General drove to Georgetown, a distance of forty miles. We were received in the kindest manner by all of the inhabitants, more especially by those who knew us as children. We then took leave, as it were, of the past scenes of childhood—dear as they must be to every honest heart—and of those who knew us as boys, however humble they might be, as well as of those with whom our association had been more intimate.

Before General Grant went abroad, which was one month later, he told me that he had called on the President and urged upon him prompt action looking to the construction of the Nicaragua Canal.

During his absence he was good enough to write me from time to time. Quotations from these letters may interest the reader, even though he has read the charming book of John Russell Young, who accompanied him during the greater part of his travels.

From London, August 26th, 1877, he writes :

"I arrived here from the continent yesterday, after a most pleasant visit of about seven weeks there, most of the time in Switzerland. There is no more beautiful scenery or climate for summer travel than Switzerland presents. The people are industrious and honest, simple and frugal in their habits, and would be very poor for all this if it were not for the travel through their country. I wish their surplus population would emigrate to the United States. . . .

"For the past eight weeks I have seen but few American papers, and am consequently behind the home news. The foreign papers, however, have been full of the great railroad strike, no doubt exaggerated, as bad as it was. The United States should always be prepared to put down such demonstrations promptly, and with severe consequences to the guilty. I hope good may come out of this in pointing out the necessity for having the proper remedy at hand in case of need. 'An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.'"

From Nice, France, December 10th, he writes :

"MY DEAR ADMIRAL:

"On Thursday, day after to-morrow, we go on board the "Vandalia," to

make our excursion of the Mediterranean. How much I wish you were in command, to unfurl for the first time your admiral's flag. . . ."

Writing of meeting the officers on board, he continues :

"Of course I told I owed you an old grudge as being responsible for the many trials and difficulties I had passed through in the last half century, for nearly that length of time ago you had rescued me from a watery grave. I am of a forgiving nature, however, and forgive you—but is the feeling universal? If the Democrats get into full power, may they not hold you responsible! But as you are about retiring, I hope no harm will come to you for any act of kindness done to me. Our trip thus far has been most agreeable. The weather in Paris was most atrocious, but I got to see much of the people. My opinion of their capacity for self-government has materially changed since seeing for myself. Before coming here I did not believe the French people capable of self-government. Now I believe them perfectly capable, and that they will be satisfied with nothing less. They are patient, 'and of long-suffering,' but there will not be entire peace and quiet until a form of government is established in which all the people have a full voice. It will be more republican than anything they have had under the name of a Republic."

DANIEL AMMEN.

(To be concluded.)

THE PRESIDENT'S POLICY.

I.

COMPLYING with your request, I submit, in writing, my views upon the questions of Party Discipline and Party Obligations.

It is unnecessary to state that, by reason of the attitude of the President toward the Democratic Party, these questions are exciting a great deal of discussion. Those who differ from him make no unjust claim when they simply demand that they should be considered as equally desirous of securing to the people an honest and efficient administration of the affairs of the government. They know that in the past thoroughly Democratic administrations have administered the government with pre-eminent success, and they view with apprehension this attempted assimilation of the two great parties by confusing the *personnel* of the office-holding classes.

Although they are stigmatized by the Independent press as "machine politicians," and although this sentimental nonsense may not, as it should, offend the ears of some holding high positions in the government, yet they firmly believe that an administration cannot be thoroughly and responsibly Democratic unless the Republicans are turned out of office and honest Democrats put in their places, and that this is the Civil Service Reform for which the Democratic Party voted at the last Presidential election.

This traditional system in American politics, which has existed up to this time and which has been upheld by men whose purity and patriotism could not be questioned, never presented to our former leaders those features of degrading demoralization which seem to shock the lofty sensibilities of this new school of modern reformers.

The Democratic Party, as is shown by their platform, are desirous that all existing abuses should be corrected ; but it is certainly not an offense to doubt whether they are prepared to admit

that a revolution in the previous methods of government is necessary in order to gratify a few *doctrinaires* who are engaged in the sensational effort of cutting down imaginary upas trees to protect the Democratic Party against the deadly poison of its own evil tendencies.

Why should the Democratic Party be placed under the tutelage of a *coterie* of self-styled reformers, whose disapproval of Democratic methods and Democratic policies has such a terrorizing influence, and whose secret aim is to rule or ruin the Democratic Party with whose principles they have not the remotest sympathy?

Of course no reference is intended to be made to that large and intelligent class of independent voters who only want good government, and who know that this end can be obtained from an administration thoroughly Democratic.

This humiliating surrender to the insolent demands of this political syndicate is not an edifying spectacle for life-long Democrats to contemplate. Men who have fought the greatest political battles of the age, who have never wavered in their devotion to the party, whose fidelity was stronger when the hope of success was faintest, and who, by their steadfastness in the face of expected defeat, proved that they had no selfish aspirations, are asking themselves whether this is a just compensation for the sacrifices they have so willingly made to secure Democratic success.

Although their counsels have been rejected with suspicion and contumely, still they are willing to manifest the same zealous devotion to their party, hoping that this debt to the Independent press will be speedily liquidated and that the Democratic Party will be released from this expensive alliance, so that it may have its own principles, policies, and methods, without daily apologizing to any one for its existence.

For this anomalous condition of affairs, the explanation is given that a great reform in our political system is being worked out. We are to have a new priesthood, a revised Testament, a clearer faith, and we are to be elevated to an atmosphere where practical politics, party discipline, and partisan reward will perish by the mere purity of the air. Men who have devoted the best energies of their lives, and have labored most zealously for the success of the Democratic Party, are to be denounced as "machine politicians" by the *dilettante* non-partisan press, rendering their recognition by a Democratic President impossible. This is the

reason why the Democratic Party has had to endure so many recent surprises.

These so-called "machine politicians" are only considered fit to make nominations and to carry elections, but are not adjudged worthy to be guests at this feast of Reform, although they may be personally honest men—good Democrats, who would efficiently discharge the duties of public office.

When a Roman slave was manumitted he was struck a blow by his master, and this was called a *felix injuria*: the fact that the blow was necessary to his freedom was a pure fiction, for he could have been made a free man without being struck. Many Democrats believe that this reform, if needed, could have been worked out without giving an unnecessary blow to the Democratic Party, which it is hoped may not prove so serious as the present deep-seated discontent would seem to indicate.

The Democratic Party did not complain that Republicans filled the offices under Republican administrations; their complaint was grounded on the fact that the Republicans grossly abused their official positions, and they promised the people that Republicans would be turned out of office because they had offended as a class, and that Democrats would be appointed in order to reform the Civil Service, and to secure the legitimate rewards of a successful contest. It is an insult to the intelligence of the Democratic Party and a reflection upon its integrity, to assume that it does not possess the moral force to work out any reform which may be desired by the American people. It is offensive to the pride of that great party to see any one of its leaders arrogate to himself the functions of a political *ensor morum*, and to treat with haughty disdain the true sentiments and the just aspirations of the masses of the Democratic Party. Those who wish to indulge in unpleasant suspicions might believe that they discover that this equivocal attitude means the creation of a Personal Party at the expense of the Democratic Party; for as yet little has been done to strengthen the cohesion of the Democratic Party. On the contrary, an attempt is being made to re-educate us, and to teach us that the virtues of party obligations, party discipline, and party fealty, which our former leaders taught us to respect as essential to the preservation of the party, are to be discarded as offenses because they are distasteful to the Purists and Reformers who are now dictating to us Democrats rules of good behavior.

It is an error to assume that those who do not accept what they consider an impracticable and un-Democratic method of reforming the Civil Service are opposed to the correction of existing abuses. They want to study this question, and to examine this system which operates to put in office such a small percentage of Democrats under a Republican administration, and to keep in office such a large percentage of Republicans under a Democratic administration. They want also to understand whether this proposed Reform will not introduce into our country an aristocratic institution which is in direct contradiction to the spirit of popular government, and whether this creation of a permanent and exclusive class of office-holders is not subversive of some of the fundamental features of our form of government.

It is a grave mistake for any one to assume the leadership of a Reform movement unless there is a concurrence of the conditions essential to its success. Leaving out the question of local and passing abuses, this country has never produced a great leader of Reform; that is, such men as have been so conspicuous in the modern history of England, France, and Italy. The slavery question is of course outside of this discussion. Why has there been in this country such an utter absence of this transcendental *rôle* now presumptuously assumed by new men? Simply because abuses with us are not existing institutions having had their birth in the middle ages, military conquest, or royal favoritism, as they exist in European countries; but they are evils which have grown into abuses by the mere indulgence of the people, and the people become their own leaders when they discover that it is time to arrest the progress of any existing abuse. The American people are remarkable for their intelligence, education, self-reliant individuality, and are capable of dissipating any abuse by the mere force of public opinion and the obedience which they can command from their Representatives. At present there is no evidence that the people are asking any one to teach them what improvement can be made upon their system of government.

But in the case of a leader undertaking to lead a party into a battle for Reform, one must be ignorant of all the conditions which are necessary for success if he does not first ascertain whether or not there be a strong united sentiment in the party, so that he can advance with unbroken line in his assault upon the opposition, and he must also ascertain that the opposition is outside and not inside

of his own party; otherwise, he will find himself engaged in a difficult and ludicrous task—showing generalship without an army, war fought without a struggle. Such an unsupported attempt at Reform must inevitably encounter resistance and resentment, because it pharisaically implies that this self-constituted leader is purer and wiser than his party, and invites the profound philosophical criticism of Edmund Burke, that “the system which lays its foundations in rare and heroic virtues will be sure to have its superstructure in the basis of profligacy and corruption.”

Mr. Gladstone is the greatest and most successful reformer of the age. His efforts were invariably sustained by a combination of favorable conditions. He had first a pre-eminent position as a leader, by virtue of his remarkable intellectual power; he attacked and uprooted abuses which were glaring and morally indefensible; there existed in his party a united and enthusiastic sentiment in favor of every reform he proposed to accomplish; in his line of attack against abuses there was not a single weak point of inconsistency or vacillation, and his Reformatory measures were in the interest of the people against the powerful influence of privileged classes, and thus equipped he led his party to victory on every field that he selected.

How many of these essential elements of success are, from a party point of view, aiding this present Reform movement in American politics? Not one. It is not surprising, therefore, that there should be so much friction and irritation within the Democratic Party.

The Independent press that so earnestly advocate this Reform, and applaud what they now call the firmness of the President, are constantly admonishing the public that Democratic leaders and the Democratic Party are not sincerely in sympathy with him upon this question. They jealously caution him that the Democratic Party are not manifesting a willing submission to his policy and to their dictum, and that there is a perilous independence of judgment in the Democratic Party on this question, which must be dominated and suppressed. On the other hand, Democrats deprecate this unearned and baneful influence of a clique outside of the Democratic Party, and refuse to surrender their conviction upon matters which they consider vitally affect their discipline and organization. But, though the future alone can unfold the result of this conflict,

it is to be hoped that those who believe that the *raison d'être* of the Democratic Party is the preservation of free constitutional government in this country, will not realize the apprehensions of evil which this unlooked-for policy would seem to forebode, and that this transient question of Civil Service Reform will not be considered of more paramount importance than the conservation of the beneficent ascendancy of the Democratic Party.

J. B. EUSTIS.

II.

It is only natural that the first Democratic administration at Washington since 1860 should have attracted an unusual amount of public attention and comment. Any critical examination, however, of the course of the administration and of the attitude of the two great national parties toward the President, necessitates at the outset a clear recognition of the functions and duties of the President and his Secretaries. It is Congress, not the President, which determines the great questions of national policy. The President's function is to administer the laws, not to enact them. He may formulate a policy for Congressional action, but it has no intrinsic value other than as a suggestion, and as indicating how the veto power would be used, should the necessity arise. His veto power is neither executive nor legislative. It is a mere power of obstruction, a brake on the machine, but no part of the machine. It is Congress alone which can be held to party responsibility for the inauguration of, or the failure to inaugurate, an executive policy. The President's policy is to carry out the purposes of Congress as representing the nation, whatever these purposes may be, so long as they are not unconstitutional. Congress thus has control of the actual policy of the government, and is the ultimate depository of executive power; while the principal importance of the President's office, so far as internal affairs are concerned, is as the head of the national administrative machinery.

In electing Congress, the people express their preference on questions of national policy. It is in the division of opinions upon such questions that political parties find the reason and justification of their existence. The result of the election determines to which party the people prefer shall be intrusted the supreme

power. In a word, the idea of party is uppermost, and the voters understand perfectly that, so far as the governmental policy which they seek to secure is concerned, they are relying upon a party, and that in party government there neither is nor can be any individual responsibility.

When the people elect a President, however, they are before all choosing a chief of their civil service, in which the thing that they most regard is precisely the individual judgment and character of the man whom they select, and for which they are unwilling to have anything whatever substituted. It has taken them a long time to learn this, but they have at last learned it, and, consequently, in 1884 they elected a President, with a *view to the things which he could do, and for the non-performance of which he could be held responsible, and not with a view to his opinions on other matters*. The issue was squarely presented by the candidates themselves in their records as public men and in their letters of acceptance. Mr. Cleveland, recognizing the nature of the office for which he was a candidate, expressly declined to enter into the discussion of legislative policy, while Mr. Blaine's long letter of acceptance was largely devoted to precisely such an irrelevant discussion. Mr. Cleveland declared that "the laws enacted by the legislative branch of the government, the chief executive is bound faithfully to enforce," and pledged himself to the administration of "the government, in the honest, simple, and plain manner which is consistent with its character and purpose." On this pledge he was elected. His recognition of this pledge, as expressed in his letter to the President of the National Civil Service Reform League, has thus far been the keynote of his administration. Let us recall what he there said.

"That a practical reform in the Civil Service is demanded is abundantly established by the fact that a statute referred to in your communication, to secure such a result, has been passed in Congress, with the assent of both political parties; and by the further fact that a sentiment is generally prevalent among patriotic people calling for the fair and honest enforcement of the law which has been thus enacted. I regard myself pledged to this because *my conception of true Democratic faith and public duty requires that this and all other statutes should be in good faith and without evasion enforced*, and because in many utterances made prior to my election as President, *approved by the party to which I belong, and which I have no disposition to disclaim*, I have in effect promised the people that this should be done." (The italics are my own.)

Now the law with regard to the administration of which par-

ticularly the President was elected, is the Civil Service law, a reform in the Civil Service having been regarded by Congress as so emphatically and imperatively necessary as to justify the enactment of the Pendleton bill. Nor should it be forgotten that this reform emanated neither from Administrations nor Congresses, but from the people. In this it is unlike the reform of the Civil Service in England, where ministers, being responsible themselves, sought the enactment of a law which would insure responsibility and fitness on the part of their subordinates. In this country, members of Congress had practical control of the patronage of the government, but had no corresponding responsibility. To them the fitness and responsibility of the subordinate office-holders was of minor importance. They were willing, consequently, to use the offices as spoils, and in this they were sustained by the traditions of both great parties. The reform, therefore, had to be initiated by the people, and as against parties, politicians, members of Congress, and Cabinet officers. The sentiment in its favor grew to revolutionary proportions, both parties began coquetting with it, and finally failed of the courage to defeat it when the persistent efforts of a few men representing a determined public sentiment brought it squarely before Congress and the President for action. The people thus scored a great victory over those party men who, lacking the courage to defeat the reform before it became a law, seek to defeat it now that it has become a law.

Now, remembering that the control of the Civil Service is the President's chief function; that the method of that control so as to secure honesty and competency is declared by a law of the land; that he is sworn to observe the law; that it was with these conditions particularly in view that he was elected by the people; and that whatever the functions of the President may be apart from those referring to the Civil Service, these latter functions are practically the only ones which he has so far been called upon to exercise to any notable degree, and for the exercise of which he is open to criticism either favorable or adverse, we readily discover the only standard by which the present administration can properly be criticised, to wit: Are President Cleveland and his Cabinet well and truly enforcing the law and living up to the terms of their pledges of reform within the sphere of their power?

Of Republican criticism, according to this standard, there has

been but little, and, as a matter of fact, there is as yet no well-developed and organized Republican criticism whatever of the President and his Secretaries. Here and there irresponsible critics blame the administration for certain acts the failure to do which would have led to much severer criticism from the same sources; for example, the Republican fault-finding with the reappointment of Mr. Pearson to the Postmastership in New York City. Here and there a bitterly partisan organ criticises the President indiscriminately for everything he does. The Republican Party as the party of opposition, relieved of the heavy burden of its own defense, has abundant leisure to attack the administration, but the more intelligent men of the party have no sympathy with such methods. The really prevalent view among Republicans, in support of which many authorities might be quoted from the Republican press—to say nothing of the Independent press, which is growing continuously larger—is that of which the “Burlington Hawkeye,” a strong partisan journal, is a fair example. Let us listen to it.

“While Mr. Cleveland is the representative of the people as their chief executive, he is entitled to fair treatment, honest criticism, and due credit for whatever he does that is deserving of approval. As yet he has developed no policy other than an apparent desire bordering on zeal to secure an efficient public service and the faithful execution of the laws. That is commendable, and let it be commended in public estimation. What else he may do, or neglect to do, time alone can develop; but Republican duty obtains in the path of honest, just, vigilant criticism.”

So the “Harrisburg Telegraph” (Republican) admits that to the President

“the corruption charged against the Republican administration before the election was very real, and the promise to remove it and purify administration binding.”

The fact is, that the administration has as yet nothing to fear from the “honest, just, and vigilant criticism” of the Republicans, for it is as yet not obnoxious to that criticism in any serious measure. It is undeniable that certain of the appointments to office by the President and his Secretaries have attracted, even if they have not deserved, hostile criticism, but this is in no appreciable measure true of the removals from office. Moreover, such occasions for criticism are recognized by even the most thoroughly partisan and biased critics to be the rare exceptions and not the general rule. Republican criticism, however, of the President and

his Cabinet, on the ground that they are not enforcing the Civil Service Reform law or living up to their pledges of reform, has, at least, a logical point of departure.

The few Democratic critics of the administration illogically enough criticise it from exactly the opposite point of view; *i. e.* just because it is honestly endeavoring to enforce the law. Thus, the New York "Sun" has recently said:

"What possible significance can be attached to the fact that President Cleveland executes the Pendleton law? It is his duty to do this, and he is doubtless well disposed towards the Civil Service theory. But herein does he represent his party? On the contrary, it is his great point of variance with his party, and it is notorious that the chief discontent which has arisen in the Democracy since Cleveland came into office has been due to this cause and no other."

Now let us see whence within the Democratic Party this discontent emanates.

The Democratic Party of to-day is not the Democratic Party of a quarter of a century ago. It is virtually a new party, with different traditions, different purposes, and a different reason for existence. Between 1860 and 1868 the Democratic Party lost many of its best men—the men who became Republicans for the sake of preserving the Union. Furthermore, it lost many of its worst men, those who became Republicans because thenceforth the Republican Party was to be the distributor of patronage. The Democratic Party for years was held together solely by virtue of the fact that for the time being it was the only possible party of opposition. Many of the men who were its leaders during the war and reconstruction periods were men who had been educated in its older traditions, and who, in case it should ever achieve a victory, hoped to see it reinstated in its old form. They rendered great service to the nation in making as vigorous an opposition as was possible to the Republican Party, which became corrupt early in its history because of the vastness of its majority and the extent of its power. Down to the time when Mr. Tilden was elected President, and when the party became a real party of aggressive reform, many of its leading spirits were not only fighting corruption, but were working to restore to power the old party, with its old traditions and old purposes.

In 1872 the Republican Party through its excesses and corruptions, and in 1876 through the commission of an unspeakable

fraud, drove large numbers of its best men into the Democratic ranks. For many years there was no distinguishable difference of purpose between the Democratic and the Republican machines. Both parties were regarded mistrustfully by patriotic and thoughtful men, by men of a new generation who regarded the war as over, and who looked to taking the offices out of the arbitrary control of all parties whatever; and, while both the party machines were fighting for the spoils, a spirit of reform was growing among the people which ultimated in the enactment of laws which, if honestly carried out, will put an end to the spoils system. Moreover, the public was beginning to believe that the time would come when a party must be held responsible for the declarations of its platform. So in 1884, the law for the reform of the Civil Service having been enacted and the time being ripe, the community, filled with mistrust for the Republican party and its candidates, elected Mr. Cleveland, in the belief that he would be true to his pledges, would enforce the law, and maintain the public interest as against all private interests whatsoever; and to-day it is the President's fortune that he is trusted and believed in by the people of this country as the representative of the merit system of appointment to office.

It is undoubtedly true that a number of men within the Democratic Party, who were perfectly willing that any promises might be made for the purpose of securing victory, are now equally willing that the party once more in power should ignore what they regard as at one time prudent but now very cumbersome pledges, take possession of the offices, and let the future take care of itself. These, however, are the small minority, a surviving remnant of the Democratic Party of 1860, or the selfish and unpatriotic men who have come into the party since that time. They are partisans of the most thorough-going kind, and they recall the fact that the President was elected as a partisan. This is in a measure true, but it was precisely the Independent vote, the vote of the intelligent men, who knew that under the law the President has no duty concerning the Civil Service which springs out of his character as a partisan, that elected Mr. Cleveland. This Democratic minority refers to the necessity for party government, forgetful of the fact that Congress and the President are independent of each other; that party government and party responsibility as they exist in England and France are impossible here. The President and the

representative body do not necessarily belong to the same party. They may even be violently at odds. While the President has control of the Civil Service, and consequently his party is said to be in power, Congress has control of the whole policy of the government, and is actually in power. The two parties between them may thus control the two branches of the government, and party government be a mere empty phrase—a name, and not a fact. The President and the Senate to-day represent opposite parties. In the mean time, however, the President is actually the head of the administrative system. He pledged his administration to purify the Civil Service, and the people elected him upon his pledge. He was asked to turn the rascals out ; he is doing what he was asked to do, and has appointed a Cabinet pledged to assist in the work. The difference between himself and some of the other members of his party is as to what is covered by the term “rascals.” The administration evidently does not understand that the term applies to all who differ with it in political opinion, but to mean the dishonest and corrupt, and those whose incompetency makes them fraudulent occupants of office. Consequently, its policy is to make removals for cause, to discover the rascals wherever they are, and to turn them out ; but to turn out no one but the corrupt, unworthy, and incompetent.

The administration cannot permit the politicians in Congress to inveigle it into the belief that they will be responsible for its acts. It prefers to disappoint the politicians rather than to disappoint a great people whose servant it is. And who, after all, *are* these politicians ? They are alike in all countries and at all times. Here is a description of them by a man who has studied them thoroughly and knows them well :

They are “not recruited among the most independent, the ablest, and the most honest, but among voluble, scheming men and zealous charlatans, who, having failed in private careers for lack of character in situations where one is watched too closely and too nicely weighed in the balance, have fallen back on vicious courses, in which the want of scrupulousness and discretion is a force instead of a weakness. To their indelicacy and impudence the doors of a public career stand wide open.” *

Such men hate and mistrust this administration instinctively. They have been too wrongly educated, or they are too shallow, to understand the forces at work in this country as a representative

* Taine’s “French Revolution,” Durand’s translation, Vol. III., p. 99

of which the President was elected, or they are too selfish or unpatriotic to care to understand. They do not know that the President, being of a new generation, represents a new generation; they do not recognize that the country is larger than the party; they do not appreciate that a political pledge possesses any sacredness; they do not realize that the government of the United States is after all only business of a peculiarly difficult and exalted kind; and, above all, they do know how little the country cares for them or their objections. They talk of arraying Congress against the President. They recall the fate of Tyler and Johnson. They do not seem to remember that if by such a course ill come to the party it is their own fault, and not the fault of the President; for the manner in which the President conducts the Civil Service is not a party question, Congress and its members are in no way responsible for it, and a controversy by Congress with the administration upon such a question can have no logical basis whatever. It is difficult for the opposition within the party to understand that "the idea that this administration, pledged to give the people better government and better officers, and engaged in a hand-to-hand fight with the bad elements of both parties, should be betrayed by those who ought to be worthy of implicit trust, is atrocious." To them, as to the cattlemen, the President might well say that where two interests, public and private, are in conflict, "the former must be considered, though private interests suffer." The Democratic Party is something more than its several leaders and their followings. It is an organic institution representing great ideas and purposes, and existing as a mighty instrument for national good rather than as a mere beneficiary of the offices, with their accompanying emoluments and powers. The administration which sacrifices the purely personal interests of the leaders and professional politicians is creating a powerful popular sentiment favorable to the party, and this is the only true foundation for any party whatever.

It is no just cause of complaint that removals are not made with sufficient rapidity. The danger is that they should be made too rapidly and the public service caused to suffer. To discover where reform is needed takes time. In a business house the balance-sheet is generally admitted to be an essential document for the determination of business questions, whether of retrenchment or expansion; but the balance-sheet of a large and compli-

cated business may be the result of weeks, sometimes of months, of work by expert accountants. Now, up to the present time, the work of the President and the Secretaries has been, and for some time to come must be, just such expert work. They are examining the books and are effecting reforms, not upon hearsay, but as they are actually found to be necessary.

The Secretary of State, acting with the Secretary of the Navy, has quietly, with dignity, and without hurrah or jingoism, protected our rights on the Isthmus of Panama without complicating our relations with other South American powers, or requiring the aid of special or extraordinary embassies. He has urged the appointment, as he should have done, of men of his own party to fill foreign missions, and has retained, as he should do independent of all political considerations, consular officers whose fitness qualifies them exceptionally for their places. The Secretary of the Navy has introduced true business methods into every bureau, has undertaken to eliminate politics from the navy-yards, has made but few removals, and those for proved incompetency or unfitness, and is enforcing the requirements of law with regard to the construction of government vessels. The Secretary of the Treasury is rooting out the irregularities of the Coast Survey Bureau and of the Customs Service. The Secretary of War is putting an end to favoritism in the service. In the Postal Service the removals and appointments are being made in the best interests of the service, and in obedience to both the letter and the spirit of the law; and the President, besides inspiring and acquiescing in every reform, has shown a disposition to compel the enforcement of laws relative to the Indians, and to put an end to the fraudulent practices in the Land Office, a thing which this country has long been looking for in vain.

The administration is thus abreast of the time, understands its spirit, the spirit of the people, the tendency of our institutions, and the necessities of our system. It is, as the President has said, fighting the "bad element in both parties." This element is full of resource, active, alert, and bitterly inimical, with all the concentration of purpose which comes from a determined selfishness, and not overburdened with political conscientiousness or public spirit. It is, consequently, a dangerous enemy to the public good. It is virtually a caste which regards all public-spirited men, in whatever party they may be, as its common enemies. It exists

for the exploitation of the public offices, and it has divided itself up among the parties as its selfishness and evil purposes dictated ; but its bond of fraternity and its unity of purpose are stronger than any party lines.

For years both parties have been too largely under the control of this element. At times they may be said to have apparently existed for it, and for it alone, while the offices of the nation have been its spoil. The struggle between the administration and the professional politicians in both parties is thus a phase of the universal struggle between the right and wrong, and the issue is not doubtful.

WILLIAM R. GRACE.

III.

THE administration of President Cleveland has certainly so far agreeably disappointed those people who looked upon the advent of the Democratic Party to power with a dread akin to that with which the New England Federalists at the beginning of this century regarded the election of Jefferson. So far the President has given us in the main a fairly decent and clean administration ; a much better one than we had reason to expect from a Simon Pure Democrat. But to admit this does not at all imply admitting that the country acted well or wisely in restoring Democratic rule. We need not accept the Federalist estimate of Jefferson in order to believe that it was a misfortune to have him elected President over Adams. The conduct of the administration hitherto has belied the golden promises of its more enthusiastic supporters to an even greater degree than it has falsified the bitter prophecies of its foes, and indeed some such outcome was the inevitable result of the incongruous political alliance by which the last campaign was won.

Last fall the Democrats were successful because in two or three pivotal States they were supported by a large number of men who had hitherto acted with the Republicans, but who on this occasion refused to accept the Republican nominee. This is not the place to discuss whether these Republicans had or had not just cause to feel outraged at the action of their party associates in forcing upon them a nomination which, it was known beforehand, would be so bitterly distasteful to them ; we have only to see if the result

of their action has been satisfactory or the reverse. Parenthetically, I would say that I am far from questioning the propriety of bolting in certain cases ; I merely question the expediency of so doing in this particular instance.

A peculiarity in the Independent movement last fall was that those who went over to the Democratic Party did not do so in consequence of having been converted to the principles for which the latter had contended for a quarter of a century, but, on the contrary, took the ground that it was the Democracy which had changed, and had come over to the position occupied by themselves. It seems to be a necessary corollary of this proposition that a man who has for twenty-five years acted in accordance with Republican principles is in so far better than one who has been a Democrat for the same period ; and that therefore the substitution in any public position of an honest and efficient man who has always been a Democrat for an honest and efficient Republican is distinctly a thing to be regretted. Therefore, when the President has in his choice of Cabinet officers, as of Bayard and Endicott, or of ministers to foreign countries, as to France and Italy, merely replaced upright and capable incumbents by men of as high personal character who, during and since the war, have been consistent Democrats, and who have therefore been lifelong opponents of all but the most recent of the movements in which the Independents have taken part, we do not see how the latter can view the change with satisfaction ; while to any man sincerely believing in the past and present of the Republican Party it can only seem an unmixed evil. Certainly no Independent can claim that any one of these changes is for the better unless there is a distinct superiority either as regards integrity or capacity on the part of the new appointee ; and so far is this from being the case, that as a rule the appointments hitherto made have been of men decidedly inferior to the old incumbents in the respects indicated.

The administration took office so recently that we are obliged to judge it mainly by the appointments made, as there has not been time for it to develop a definite policy, except, perhaps, on the subject of Civil Service Reform. Here the President undoubtedly deserves great credit for having done precisely what his Republican predecessor did ; that is, for having obeyed the laws in reference thereto—which laws, we may remark in passing, were made by a Republican Congress. When, for instance, Higgins and

Chenoweth entered into a conspiracy to defraud a Republican applicant of the place to which he was by law entitled, the President promptly reversed the action of his subordinates, and deserves hearty praise for so doing; but he should be severely blamed for permitting these same conspirators to retain office. Again, it is to his credit that there was no return to the old Democratic system of making an immediate and clean sweep of all offices, so as the law would permit. Nevertheless, it must be remembered that the removals have gone on steadily, if quietly, and at a speed which, if continued for the Presidential term at the present constantly accelerating rate, will effect almost as complete a change as if a clean sweep had been made at the beginning. In certain cases, notably in that of the New York postmaster-ship, capable men already in office have been retained; and for this the President has both received and deserved much praise. But these instances have been the exceptions, made for particular purposes, usually to conciliate a particular class of voters. At the same time that the New York postmaster was retained, the surveyor of the port, an almost equally satisfactory public servant, who was quite as little of a partisan, was turned out, and his place filled by a mere second-rate party henchman, an understrapper of County Clerk Keenan's. Any principle on which one of these officers was retained applied equally well to the other, and the reason for the difference in their treatment is plain. The postmaster was a particular favorite with the Independents, to whom Mr. Cleveland owed his election—indeed, he was generally believed to have been in sympathy with their movement—and in plain English his retention in office was simply and solely what politicians would call a "recognition" of the Independent vote. On no other theory can we reconcile the action taken in this instance with the course generally pursued by the administration in regard to the numerous postmasters, who, although perfectly satisfactory, and not "offensive partisans," have been obliged to make way for Democrats in Minnesota, Nebraska, and other States where there is no Independent vote to conciliate. It is a poor rule that does not work both ways; and to offer "offensive partisanship" as the excuse for removing Republicans, while supplanting them all over the country by Democrats of the stamp of Mr. Aquila Jones, can only be set down as a piece of pharisaical cant.

In criticising Mr. Cleveland, it must be remembered that while

in one aspect he is doubtless an entirely independent man, in another he is simply the most important cog in what is familiarly known as the Manning Machine, of which two of his Cabinet officers are also constituent parts, and which in fact derives its name from one of them. The policy of this organization (which is the lineal successor of the long-famed Albany Regency) since Mr. Cleveland became President has been the same as it was during his term as Governor. He and his advisers unquestionably much prefer to do right, other things being equal; but for the last year or two this matter of doing right has been subordinated to a skillful and remarkably successful effort to placate the Independents and more upright Democrats on the one hand, and at the same time to satisfy the politicians and keep them in line and thoroughly enthusiastic. For success in this effort a kind of balance of good and bad appointments and actions has been relied on. Thus Pearson is retained as postmaster, and that obscure and timid protégé of Hubert O. Thompson, Mr. Hedden, is forthwith appointed collector; Messrs. Fairchild and Higgins take office nearly simultaneously; and Judge Endicott is relied upon as an argument wherewith to silence one class of the Administration's New England supporters when they complain of the appointment of that pet idol of another class, the amiable Pillsbury. So it was during the last portion of Mr. Cleveland's gubernatorial career, when, for example, he approved the Reform bills presented by the Special Legislative Investigating Committee, but declined to punish the chief of the offenders whose conduct had made the bills necessary. The most charitable can hardly regard it as merely an unfortunate coincidence that this same chief offender (the head of one of the three rival wings of that peculiar and tripartite fowl, the New York City Democracy) should have been, during the eight months that Mr. Cleveland refrained from taking action on the charges against him, one of the latter's most enthusiastic supporters both for the nomination and the election.

This two-sided policy is due to the make-up of the party. Thanks to its copperhead ancestry, the Democracy can count with certainty upon the support of all the Southern whites, good or bad, no matter how their views differ on public questions; but in the North, until very lately, almost all of its supporters were, and even now the great bulk of them are, drawn from the least intelligent and least virtuous classes of the community. For-

tunately for the country, however, it was found that to insure success it was necessary to do more than merely consult the passions and prejudices of iron-clad Bourbons and ignorant proletaries, and so the leaders very wisely began acting on the advice of that lamented exponent of Democratic principles, the late Fernando Wood, to "pander to the better element." In consequence, there has been for some time, notably last fall, a movement of really excellent voters into the Democracy; and the party leaders have had to bid for the support of these men (who, though most high principled as a class, know little of politics, and are quite easily hoodwinked) by much promise, and a small but still appreciable quantity of performance of good. If, as they stoutly maintain, the Independents have for the last twenty-five years been right, it follows of necessity that their present political bedfellows have up almost to this very moment been wrong; and nothing but the perfection of the machine discipline in the ranks of their old adherents has enabled the Democratic managers to keep the latter in the same line with their new supporters. Of these old adherents, by the way, Mr. Cleveland is, greatly to his credit, far less truly a representative than is his copperhead colleague on the Presidential ticket, a gentleman who seems to be now, as always in the past, most offensively anxious to identify himself with whatever is worst in American politics.

It is impossible here to discuss Mr. Cleveland's appointments at length; I can only briefly refer to the most important, taking the Cabinet first. The cases of Messrs. Bayard and Endicott have already been touched on. No one but an extreme Democratic partisan will rank Mr. Manning with the Republicans who have preceded him in the Treasury Department. On the other hand, it must be acknowledged that naval administration has been the weak point in recent Republican rule, and Secretary Whitney will not have to do very well in order to surpass his predecessors—though his course so far seems to have been dictated less by a wish to reform the navy than by a desire to make political capital. The last Republican Postmaster-General did not leave a happy reputation behind him; but none of his acts began to show the brutal and cynical contempt for every principle of Civil Service Reform that crops out in that preposterous document, Mr. Vilas' famous congressional circular on "Patronage Apportionment." One of the chief counts made by the Independents against the Republicans

has been their support of Mahone; and the first act of Secretary Garland, after having become the chief legal officer of the new administration, was to appear in court on behalf of the Virginia repudiators. His other distinguishing feat has been his remarkable opinion to the effect that a Presidential pardon can override a constitutional amendment.

To speak of Mr. Lamar naturally brings up the question of Southern appointments. The mass of the Northern people now feel no bitterness whatever toward the gallant ex-Confederates of the South. We readily acknowledge that they honestly thought their cause just, and we have nothing but praise for their heroic constancy and brilliant courage. Yet we feel sure that history will declare the War of the Rebellion to be both of all modern wars the most important, and also the one in which the dividing lines between right and wrong were sharpest drawn. A Tory of 1776 had far more right on his side than had a Confederate of 1860. Doubtless most Tories firmly believed their cause right, and after the Revolution they should have been treated as soon as possible like their loyal fellow-citizens. But had this been done, exceptions would of course have been made in some cases—as in that of Benedict Arnold, and those of the men who under Johnson and Butler took part in the Cherry Valley and Wyoming massacre. When Mr. Lamar half-masts the flag out of respect to the unsavory memory of ex-Secretary Thompson, we feel quite as indignant as our forefathers would have been at a similar tribute paid to a follower of Butler or Johnson. So with Jefferson Davis, who enjoys the unique distinction of being the only American with whose public character that of Benedict Arnold need not fear comparison. An item appeared recently in the papers to the effect that a certain office-seeker was relying largely upon a letter in his favor from Jefferson Davis, and as Mr. Lamar has long posed as the professional apologist of the latter, the item was very probably correct. Now a revolutionary patriot might have been very liberal-minded indeed, and yet would scarcely have cared to see a Cabinet officer appointed to whose good graces a letter from Benedict Arnold would have proved a passport. Nor, had the aforesaid patriot voiced his objections, would it have been proper to accuse him of performing that operation which was the post-revolutionary equivalent of “waving the bloody shirt.” We are heartily glad to welcome back the prodigal son, to put him on a complete equality with ourselves, and to give him his full

share of the fatted calf ; but we strongly object to that particular variety of prodigal son who passes his time lamenting that the husks did not hold out longer, and praising the most obnoxious of the companions who led him astray.

Next in importance come the foreign missions. Those to France and Italy have already been spoken of. In England, Lowell's place is filled by a gentleman doubtless most estimable as a lawyer and private citizen, but whose sole record as a public man was his having once made a very foolish and abusive speech against the greatest American of the nineteenth century, Abraham Lincoln. On the principle that among the blind the one-eyed is king, Mr. Pendleton's appointment to Germany was satisfactory, and it was additionally so as being a snub to that most sordid and unlovely body, the Ohio Democracy ; but to compare him to his predecessor, Mr. Karson, is to compare a soft-money copperhead, who did excellently as regards Civil Service Reform, with a hard-money Union man who did fairly well on the same question. Finally comes that purely *bouffe* personage, Mr. Keiley—about the most discreditable diplomatic appointment ever made by the United States—a man equally offensive to the countries to which he was sent, and to that from which he came. Rarely, indeed, is one who openly avows his disloyalty to a government immediately made the representative of that government abroad—although in reference to the open avowal it is but just to say that Mr. Keiley apparently unites so fluent a tongue to so addled a brain that none of his remarks can be taken very seriously.

There is space barely to touch on the minor appointments. Higgins, it was at first said by the President's defenders, was merely an ugly exception. As such he would be wholly unimportant ; but he is all-important now that he has proved to be but the type of a large clan whom the new administration delights to honor. Thomas, for example, recently appointed Indian agent, was a Baltimore politician of the most pronounced Higgins stripe, and his choice goes far to show that Higgins was no accident. Again, in New England the three most important appointments, after that of Judge Endicott, were those of Pillsbury, Chase, and Troop. These men represent the very vilest forces in New England politics ; they stand for disloyalty to the nation in the past, and for political dishonesty in the present, and they are but types of scores of similar cases. The New York and Philadelphia custom houses

afford additional examples. Throughout the Northern States the new appointees are as a whole most distinctly inferior to the Republicans whose places they take. If, as an apology for the President, it is said that these and countless other appointments have been made under bad advice, we can only answer that it is to be regretted that we have a chief executive the number of whose bad advisers is so inordinately large.

That many of the administration's new supporters continue to speak of it in terms of unqualified, and rather hysterical, praise can only be explained by reference to the curious fashion which has obtained among many of these same men, during the last few years, of viewing with indifference deeds when done by a Democrat which if done by a Republican would have been most savagely attacked—a kind of mental and moral strabismus, well illustrated by the way they criticised the forty-seventh and forty-eighth Congresses respectively. The Republican Congress passed an outrageous river and harbor bill, it is true ; but, in their turn, so did the Democrats. During the life of both Congresses the great questions to be solved were those of Civil Service Reform, relief from over-taxation, and finance. The Republicans met all three, at least partially, passing a vitally important Civil Service law, a small tariff reduction law, and an important banking act. The Democrats, on the contrary, defeated a Civil Service Reform law, declined to give an relief from taxation, and refused to take the action pressingly needed on the silver question. These were the salient points in the careers of the two bodies ; yet the very same persons who went into a condition of mind bordering on intellectual epilepsy at the bare mention of Mr. Keifer's Congress viewed with most unruffled calm the even worse proceedings of the Congress of Mr. Carlisle.

We can readily appreciate, though we may not at all agree with, the attitude of those who at the last election wished primarily to rebuke the Republican Party, even at the cost of a four years' Democratic administration, provided the latter was under so comparatively safe a man as Mr. Cleveland ; but most certainly events have wofully falsified the hopes of those who believed that a change from a Republican to a Democratic administration would be in itself a change for the better. It is both comical and pathetic to compare what the much-glorified "Reform Democracy" has really done, with the expectations concerning it apparently entertained by those well-meaning but somewhat vague persons who, after the

last election, spent a large portion of their presumably valuable time in sounding the variations upon the chorus in Shelley's "Hellas :"

"The world's great age begins anew, the golden years return."

That Mr. Cleveland has done better than most other Democrats would have done, and that he has done as well as his party would let him, is probably true ; and his numerous shortcomings and failures simply show that under the most favorable circumstances the Democratic Party, as at present constituted, is not fit to be intrusted with the care of the National Government.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

GENERAL GRANT TO HIS FATHER.

I.

DEAR SIR :—I take pleasure in complying with your suggestion to send you the inclosed letter from my father to my grandfather. It was written two days before he started on the Vicksburg campaign.

Yours truly,

F. D. GRANT.

ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE, Esq.

II.

MILLIKEN'S BEND, LA., *April 21, 1863.*

DEAR FATHER :—Your letter of the 7th of April has just this day reached me. I hasten to answer your interrogations. When I left Memphis, with my past experience, I prohibited trade below Helena. Trade at that point had previously been opened by the Treasury Department. I give no permits to buy cotton, and if I find any one engaged in the business I send them out of the Department and seize their cotton for the Government. I have given a few families permission to leave the country and to take with them, as far as Memphis, their cotton. In doing this I have been deceived by unprincipled speculators, who have successfully smuggled themselves along with the army in spite of orders prohibiting them, and have been compelled to suspend this favor to persons anxious to get out of Dixie.

I understand that Government has adopted some plan to regulate getting the cotton out of the country. I do not know what plan they have adopted, but am satisfied that any that can be adopted, except for Government to take the cotton themselves, and rule out speculators altogether, will be a bad one. I feel all army followers who are engaged in speculating off the misfortunes of their country, are really aiding the enemy more than they

could possibly do by open treason, should be drafted at once and put in the first forlorn hope.

I move my head-quarters to New Carthage to-morrow. This whole country is under water, except strips of land behind the levees, along the river and bayous, and makes operations almost impossible.

I struck upon a plan which I thought would give me a foothold on the east bank of the Mississippi before the enemy could offer any great resistance. But the difficulty of the last one and a half miles next to Carthage makes it so tedious that the enemy cannot fail to discover my plans. I am doing my best, and am full of hope for complete success. Time has been consumed, but it was absolutely impossible to avoid it. An attack upon the rebel works at any time since I arrived here must inevitably have resulted in the loss of a large portion of my army, if not in an entire defeat. There were but two points of land, Haines Bluff and Vicksburg itself, out of water at any place from which troops could march. These are thoroughly fortified, and it would be folly to attack them as long as there is a prospect of turning their position. I never expect to have an army under my command whipped unless it is very badly whipped and can't help it; but I have no idea of being driven to do a desperate or foolish act by the howlings of the press. It is painful to me, as a matter of course, to see the course pursued by some of the papers. But there is no one less disturbed by them than myself. I have never sought a large command, and have no ambitious ends to accomplish. Were it not for the very natural desire of proving myself equal to anything expected of me, and the evidence my removal would afford that I was not thought equal to it, I would gladly accept a less responsible position. I have no desire to be an object of envy or jealousy, nor to have this war continue. I want to put down the rebellion in the shortest possible time, and will do my part toward it without expecting or desiring any other recognition than a quiet approval of my course.

I beg that you will destroy this letter; at least, do not show it.

Julia and the children are here, and will go up by the first good boat. I sent for her to come down and get some instructions about some business I want attended to, and see no immediate prospect of attending to myself.

ULYSSES.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

I.

WHILE I was not intimate with General Grant, we were always upon pleasant terms. I held him in high regard. His words on his death-bed, like his deeds upon battle-fields, served his country. They strengthened our Union by promoting good-will between all sections.

HORATIO SEYMOUR.

II.

“GRANT’S Memorial : What shall it be ?” I merely add a few suggestions to those already made. A deliberate opinion of what might be best can only be expressed after careful study, and perhaps then only through design.

I state, therefore, only certain personal wishes.

I should wish that Grant’s memorial might distinctly recall the pathetic memories of his death, as well as the story of his name.

Perhaps this impression would be made should his tomb be at the front or central approach to the monument. It might mark more strictly then a resting-place for his body, and might be the memorial of his personal life. Around, behind, and above it, but forming one connected whole, should rise the monument to his fame, and what that means to the United States.

Within its inclosure, or at the entrance to its inclosure, might be the statue of Grant, the general of the armies, who gave us peace. Around the walls, or on the great base or bases of the building, for the make of the ground would lead naturally to stages or steps, we might perhaps place reliefs, inscriptions, medallions, and other records giving the story of the war.

Both South and North and the whole Union should be represented, inside or out, of the building.

I should wish that some form of lighting, with splendor of color perhaps, might point out the building by night and make it to be seen from afar.

For any fixed particular form or architectural style of monument I can have to-day no undivided affection, but I should regret very much any form which might suggest a destination or meaning for the building other than that of a memorial—the monument of an idea.

Simple as the problem undoubtedly is, modern architectural art, at least the art of to-day, has not been able to rival any one of the memorials of the past in beauty or conception.

The mere practice of architecture, painting, or sculpture, can only help to guide or instruct the original mind and prevent the misdirection of energy ; it will never supply original feeling or imagination.

Perhaps, after all, this failure of the Old World might lead us to hope that the time has come when, among our architects and artists here, some mind or associated minds may be found capable of embodying an idea.

JOHN LAFARGE.

III.

THE question is asked "Ought our present national banking system to be continued?"

I answer unhesitatingly that it should be, and for the sufficient reason that it answers admirably the purpose for which it was established. We have a vast intranational commerce, probably greater than that of any other people on the face of the earth, which requires an adequate medium for exchange. The variety and number of experiments that have been made to supply this would surprise any one not versed in our commercial history. But they all failed, one after another, in greater or less degree, to answer the purpose. Some of them were absolutely pernicious, encumbering, and lessening the very business they were created to facilitate. All, in turn, had their day and their history, until they were finally supplanted by our present system of national banks. When any instrument of civilization proves itself adequate to the purpose for which it was created, and superior to every other which has been tried, it has vindicated its right to existence, and ought to be continued until some new want arises or some changed condition proves it to be inadequate, and that some new system will accomplish the purpose better. The National Bank struck down by Gen. Jackson had serious defects. It was amenable to the charge of favoritism, and it naturally mingled with the politics of the country. The present system is free from those objections ; for while it is called a national banking system, and the banks are called national banks, neither the government nor its officers do any banking business through them, nor do they become a factor in politics any more than private banks. Free from these objections, they furnish a uniform medium of exchange throughout the limits of the Republic. Everywhere their bills circulate and are of uniform value. Such a result, in its use to a trade absolutely and happily free among the States, is beyond estimate. The uniform and equal value of the bills of the national banks is obtained by their being firmly grounded on the revenues of the country. Webster has said, "The revenue is the State," so that, as long as the government lasts, the value of its bank-notes is permanent and secure. While the government can do no banking business, properly so-called, through these banks, with the general public, yet it interferes so far as to put restrictions upon them, to prevent abuses which naturally spring up where the issue of paper money is permitted. In this respect its control is absolute, and is exercised uniformly, without partiality, and with no possible motive save that of the public good. It requires the banks to make it secure, and in return it secures absolute safety to the bill-holders. As far as my knowledge extends, no banking system of equal utility has ever been devised. A special evidence

of its adaptation to the wants of our people is that heretofore, in every period of depression, a rank crop of theories in respect to the currency has been produced ; while now, at a time of almost unexampled and long-protracted derangement of trade, hardly any one thinks of changing the currency. On the contrary, objections to our banking system and our currency are rapidly dying out. In no other banking system, at least in this country, has the bill-holder had the kind of security which the national banking laws give him, nor security that gave anything like equal confidence. A single danger menaces this system. It lies in the fact that the bonds, which are the security of the bill-holders, are continually being paid off and absorbed by the Government. If the process continues, the bonds must in time become insufficient in volume to supply the necessary increase of banking facilities, and to this question statesmen and economists will do well to turn their attention.

RUFUS HATCH.

IV.

MR. EDITOR : Mr. M. J. Savage, in his article on the newspaper, printed in *THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW* for August last, intimates that he is "not yet ready to write to order or for pay." As one who for the better part of his life has written in newspapers, not infrequently "to order," though always "for pay," I should like to ask if Mr. Savage expects the staff of a newspaper to write without orders and gratuitously. I hope I am not uncivil in saying that he preaches to order and for pay every Sunday. If he should be in the habit of informing his congregation that he did not feel like preaching, or if his congregation should inform him that they did not feel like paying, there would come a speedy end of his preaching in that church. I am not certain that the Editor of *THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW* did not order, in a certain sense, Mr. Savage's article, and I am sure that it was paid for. He may say that he was permitted to write as he pleased ; but suppose he had not pleased the editor ? He may say that he did not write for "pay." But suppose the editor had not paid him—would he have been ready to write again on the same terms ? Once more, Mr. Savage preaches what a great many of the Christians of Boston do not regard as Christianity at all. They not only think that he is a heretic, but that he has neglected the means of grace. If they should say that he is both doing wrong, and that he is doing it for pay, they would repeat substantially what Mr. Savage intimates of newspaper editors and writers.

To admit that as a newspaper writer I have always regarded myself as an advocate, would be doing myself some injustice ; but when an editor has given me certain facts, I have never thought it to be my business to substantiate them. He was responsible for their accuracy ; my duty was to present them in as forcible a light as possible, with a natural commentary, such as the editor wanted. If I suspected error, I might mention it to him ; if he persisted, I went on with the feeling that he acted on better information than mine. If I thought a newspaper upon which I was employed so dishonestly conducted as to exercise an immoral influence, I should leave it, but the presumption is that I should never have been engaged upon it at all.

It may be true that newspapers cater too assiduously to the morbid appe-

tites of the readers by their publication of the details of crime. The question, though a difficult one, is usually determined by censors like Mr. Savage, who know nothing of the embarrassments of journalism, in a dogmatic way. Does he suppose that it has never been conscientiously considered by journalists? In determining how much or how little to print of criminal intelligence, mistakes may sometimes be made; but these are nothing to the mistake which would be made by its general exclusion. The truth is, newspapers publish criminal intelligence as they do other news. When this chance is of a kind calculated to awaken unusual public interest, there is a temptation to indulge in overminuteness of detail, because, in anticipation of a judicial investigation, it is impossible to estimate the value of different circumstances. Readers resolve themselves into a great informal jury, and are making up their minds. If this be wrong there is no help for it. If a mysterious murder should be committed in a house next to Mr. Savage's rectory, he would talk about it with everybody for a week. Every house in which a murder is done is next to some other house, and is in the midst of a neighborhood, which in turn is part of a larger neighborhood. Every man is interested for various reasons. He may himself be killed mysteriously. Some of his dearest friends may meet with the same fate. He may conscientiously desire the maintenance of the laws, and the general safety of the community. Even if only his curiosity or his logical functions are awakened, it is but natural. He may read his newspaper, as he might read Mr. De Quincey's "Three Memorable Murders," or some of "The State Trials." Of course he wants the diagrams which give Mr. Savage so much offense. Whether he is the more likely himself to become homicidal on account of this taste, I will not undertake to determine philosophically; but my impression is that he is not.

As to *crim. con.* and divorce cases, I suppose that reports of them may do some harm in particular instances; but the injury they inflict is as nothing to that which would follow their rigid and systematic suppression. Social sinners like nothing so much as secrecy, and dread nothing so much as the newspaper; and no doubt it keeps many cautious people out of scrapes. They would not mind being found out by two or three, but they do not relish being found out by the whole community.

The faults of reporting result from the necessarily hasty nature of the work. Usually I have found distinguished people willing to be somewhat misrepresented, rather than not reported at all. I have known even clergymen to exhibit this weakness. The whole business of interviewing, except under circumstances of pressing necessity, Mr. Savage cannot like less than I do.

Newspapers will never be much better than they now are. Some of them will be better than others, but all of them will have faults; and in this respect they are like pulpits.

CHARLES T. CONGDON.

V.

MR. EDITOR: As Mr. Rossiter Johnson has made my recent article, entitled "Two Years of Civil Service Reform," the occasion for attacking and misrepresenting several gentlemen, some of whom are my personal friends, perhaps I owe them some words of justice. Not Mr. Rossiter Johnson, but only a man

of distinction, even by the use of your influential pages, could characterize with any injurious effect our Minister to England as "a country lawyer," and "a reviler of the government." Mr. Phelps therefore needs no defense against such impotent sneers or baseless insinuations. But when Mr. Phelps is thus assailed, we naturally recall him as not only one of the ablest and best educated of American lawyers, but as one of a half a dozen or less of the most graceful and effective speakers of his profession. We remember that he pursued his profession with distinction in New York City and in the Supreme Court at Washington, and we are glad to learn that the barristers and judges of England have appreciated, as highly as ourselves, those rare personal and professional qualities which made Mr. Phelps President of our National Bar Association and a Professor in the Law School of Yale College, one of the two oldest and most famous of our institutions of learning.

Mr. Rossiter Johnson, doubtless without that intent, is as unjust to Mr. Blaine as he is to Mr. Phelps; for he argues, in effect, that Mr. Blaine had no forecast concerning the last election, and that all the Republicans in New York who voted against him believed the grave charges he was under. The facts are that many persons, who did not believe the charges, voted against Mr. Blaine by reason of his unfriendliness to reform, especially shown years before.

Mr. Blaine comprehended that in New York, where a State Civil Service Reform law approved by Governor Cleveland was being enforced, there must be thousands of voters with whom that issue was paramount. According to a policy formally announced to me of making the Reform issue prominent before the people, I prepared a statement on the subject, at the request of the Republican National Committee, by whom it was fully approved early in the campaign. It was nevertheless not issued according to the original plan, as a campaign document. The enemies of reform, of Mr. Rossiter Johnson's and not of Mr. Blaine's way of thinking, unfortunately had their way for a few weeks, while Mr. Blaine was on his western tour. When he reached New York on his return, he quickly saw the mistake made, and that the suppression of the Reform issue would cost him many votes. His forcible and significant *Reform* speeches at Brooklyn and in the city of New York showed a sagacity and adroitness for retrieving that blunder, which Mr. Rossiter Johnson seems unable to comprehend, if indeed they are not quite beyond the range of his reflections. Mr. Blaine will hardly thank Mr. Rossiter Johnson for a defense at the expense of both his character and his foresight.

Mr. Rossiter Johnson's charges and insinuations against Postmaster Pearson and President Cleveland cannot be excused on the plea of lack of information or of haste. They exhibit a reckless indifference to justice as well as facts.

I will not stop to notice Mr. Rossiter Johnson's absurd inference to the effect that all or nearly all of the 1,200 post-office employes, whose voting he declares Mr. Pearson defeated, would have voted for Mr. Blaine. Mr. Blaine might not have got half their votes. Perhaps I may know as much as Mr. Rossiter Johnson on this subject. For several years, Democrats, Republicans, and Independents, with equal facility, have secured places in the New York Post Office. The whole charge against Mr. Pearson is a reckless, disgraceful falsehood. I use these words deliberately, because Mr. Rossiter Johnson could

easily have learned the facts at his own door in New York, as was his plain duty, before writing such slanders. The facts absolutely beyond dispute are that Mr. Pearson, following his custom in former years of closing the post-office early on election days in aid of voting, did last year have the usual placards printed and posted announcing that the office would close at 10 A.M. on election day. Having afterwards learned, through the journals, that the Postmaster-General had ordered post-offices to be kept open on that day, Mr. Pearson telegraphed to him for instructions. Upon being informed in reply that the New York office must be kept open, Mr. Pearson was compelled to have the notices taken down. But he promptly gave instructions to all superintendents to arrange the work of their men so that every one should have an opportunity to vote. Mr. Pearson declares he has no reason to think that any one of them was prevented from voting. His character and public services will command credence for his words and faith in his just intentions, whatever Mr. Rossiter Johnson may say.

In part by direct statement and in part by innuendo, Mr. Rossiter Johnson charges that President Cleveland appointed Mr. Pearson postmaster for partisan reasons, and as a reward for securing the President's election through keeping the post-office clerks from the polls. Perhaps Mr. Rossiter Johnson does not appreciate the gravity of his charges. The facts I have stated prove it to be false. Not a fact is stated by Mr. Rossiter Johnson which tends to justify the making of it. So far from acting from partisan or other base motives imputed by that gentleman, I have the best knowledge possible that no such motives influenced the President. When I told the President how much the re-appointment of Mr. Pearson would help the work of reform, instead of being ready or willing to do so, as Mr. Rossiter Johnson charges, the President replied promptly and plumply that he would not appoint Mr. Pearson, even if he were a Democrat. He further stated that there were grave charges in writing against Mr. Pearson.

These charges, I should add, in no way related to anything referred to by Mr. Rossiter Johnson. They had been concocted and kept a secret from Mr. Pearson by the friends of the old spoils system, which, I judge, Mr. Rossiter Johnson admires, for the purpose of crushing Mr. Pearson, one of the most effective enemies of that system. To these charges, utterly false and libelous, I prepared complete answers in writing and under oath, and had submitted to the President, which were so conclusive that the appointment of Mr. Pearson speedily followed. Had Mr. Rossiter Johnson known any of these or other material facts, I will presume he would not now stand before the country as guilty of fabricating and causing to be printed in its foremost political Review, a false, improbable, and outrageous charge against the President of the United States.

DORMAN B. EATON.

In justice to our eminent contributor we publish this Comment, but in future we shall be obliged to request that Comments shall relate to articles published in the REVIEW and not to Comments on articles. No volunteer Note or Comment, also, must exceed five hundred words.

EDITOR.

VI.

EDWARD H. G. CLARK, in the September number of the *REVIEW*, makes use of these words : "Gold is the money of the world (in spots), only because," etc. As the belief appears to be more or less prevalent that gold is the world's money only "in spots," it may be of interest to give the facts of the matter. The following are the leading countries of the world, with the monetary standards nominally in existence in each, the term "mixed" denoting both gold and silver :

<i>Gold.</i>	<i>Silver.</i>	<i>Mixed.</i>
Brazil,	Austria,	Belgium.
Canada,	China,	Chili,
Denmark,	Colombia,	Cuba,
Germany,	India,	France,
Great Britain and Ireland,	Japan,	Greece,
Sweden and Norway,	Mexico,	Italy,
Portugal,	Peru,	Netherlands,
Turkey.	Russia.	Spain,
		Switzerland,
		United States.

As a matter of financial fact, however, a country actually has, and can have, but a single monetary standard at any one time. It must be either gold or silver alone. For illustration, the United States theoretically possesses a double standard, but actually it has a single standard, and that one gold. The following shows the actual standard in existence in the countries named, based on the preponderance of gold or of silver in each, with their population at the latest census :

<i>Gold.</i>		<i>Silver.</i>
Brazil	11,831,326	Austria-Hungary 35,839,428
Canada	4,506,563	Belgium 5,585,846
Cuba	1,394,516	Chili 2,420,500
Denmark	2,096,400	China *300,000,000
France	37,672,048	Colombia 3,000,000
German Empire	45,235,061	Greece 1,979,423
Great Britain and Ireland	35,246,563	India 252,541,210
Italy	28,452,639	Mexico 9,786,629
Japan	36,700,110	Netherlands 4,172,921
Portugal	4,550,699	Peru 3,050,000
Russia	98,223,000	
Spain	16,625,860	
Sweden and Norway	6,479,168	
Switzerland	2,846,102	
Turkey	24,987,000	
United States	50,155,783	
	407,002,837	
		* Estimated.
		618,375,937

Deduct the 552,000,000 inhabitants of the semi-civilized lands, China and India, from the silver total, and there is left but about 66,000,000, which is less than one-sixth of the number of people in the gold standard countries here mentioned. It will thus be seen that the "spots" in which gold is "the money of the world" comprise practically all there is in the world of progress, intelligence, and enlightenment.

C. M. HARVEY.

VII.

MR. STEPHENS, in the note on "Corporations and Monopolies," proposes, as a remedy for the existing evils, that the State shall manage not only public affairs, but public conveniences—railways, telegraphs, and the like. He says the States of Europe control all those things : why should not we also ? Long ago a man of deep experience and much practical wisdom emphasized these words, and with some of us they have held their power ever since: "You cannot make a paternal government out of a Democracy." Have we not seen it ? We set out with Church and State, and soon gave it up. It would not work at all. There are many who see equal reasons for abandoning School and State, since there seems no limit to the extent to which the State is bound to educate when it once begins. Given the rudiments, let the people manage as they want them. The old cry of "taxation without representation" is rising high among those who do not approve of the system. If the State were something tangible one might see the way out. But our political experience ought to have taught us that the more power the State has, and the more it governs, the more the way is opened for bribery and corruption, and for just that kind of power which the so-called monopolists have exercised. Nor would the revenues of the State be very much increased thereby. If public sentiment is not pure enough to brand these men who "water stock" and steal from the people, it would not any more keep things pure if the State—that is, politicians—should undertake the management. The fault lies not in the system, but in want of honesty—of a sentiment among the people which shall lead us to despise men that steal, and show that we despise them. Are they despised now ? Oh, no ! they have "the uppermost places at feasts and the chief seats in the synagogues." The fact is, we pretend to govern ourselves, and yet don't do it. The city of New York fell into evil ways, partly because the better men would not take the trouble to do their duty and take their part in the government. We remember it well. It was often regarded as too much trouble even to vote. As there are always men who do not find it any trouble to vote early and often, they have graciously undertaken the whole. We want better men (and women), and not more power in the State. The State has quite enough to do even now. And is it not true that even the governments of Europe always move on well-oiled wheels, if we may credit all that is told, though they may control the railways and telegraphs.

MARY A. PARKER.

VIII.

MR. EDITOR : The members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union feel that their cause has been assailed, and their opinions shown in a false light, by Gail Hamilton, in her article in the REVIEW for July. Being a member of that Union, I ask leave to reply. "Prohibition in Practice" opens with a mistake—"The lull in temperance enthusiasm caused," etc. The W. C. T. U. deny that there is, or has been, a lull in enthusiasm. Our Union numbers from 160,000 to 170,000 women. Never was better work done, never were workers more hopeful. Because the delegates from this great body of women, in their National Convention last October, almost unanimously resolved to use their influence in favor of the third party, instead of for either of the two old parties, the author of "Prohibition in Practice" refers to that action as "the folly of

a few foolish women." The 150,000 men that voted for the third party candidate are "the few bad men." These 160,000 women and 150,000 men, we are told, "prostituted prohibition to the Democratic Party." Gail Hamilton is too much of a politician to view with impartial judgment the acts and opinions of any party to which she is opposed. "Persons," she says, "who profess to be working for humanity, resist the attempt (by high license) to restrain the liquor traffic as strenuously as if it were an attempt to extend." The W. C. T. U. oppose high license, not because it attempts to restrain, but because it only means to restrain partially. In the facts that she produces to show the good results of high license, we see strong reasons for pushing on toward absolute prohibition. We are told that in nineteen cities high license reduced the number of dram-shops from 733 to 468, closing 265. The closing of these 265, she assures us, produced marked beneficial results; arrests fell off, and there was 30 per cent. less of drunkenness. If the closing of 265 diminishes drunkenness by 30 per cent., and it is desirable still further to diminish drunkenness, why not close another 265? Our hope is to make drinking and saloons not respectable; to create a public opinion that will prevent the male youth of the land from beginning to form the habit, just as it now prevents the female youth. Admitting (which we do not) that prohibition in Maine is a failure, we believe that much, if not all of that failure, is due to the persistent outcry against prohibitory law kept up in the other States. This outcry instigates and encourages Maine men to break the law. Gail Hamilton says: "The American idea of personal liberty is a more sacred trust than personal temperance; a man must often be left free to do wrong rather than be forced to do right." The W. C. T. U. have as high an idea of personal liberty as any American, and fully accept the idea that a man must often be left free to do wrong rather than forced to do right, if the wrong be only to himself. The drinking-habit is a wrong to those that do not drink, because it so crazes a man that he is often dangerous to life and limb. We look upon drunkenness as a disease, and society has ever claimed the right to protect citizens from dangerous diseases. The advocates of high license make the loud outcry that personal liberty is violated by prohibition. We see in high license a much more gross violation of the equal rights principle, which is the fundamental principle of a Democratic government. High license creates a monopoly, and puts the traffic in liquor in the hands of a few men rich enough to pay the required \$500. If it be right to license and sell liquor, it is not right to put the license so high as to rob poor men of the business. If it be right to exclude women from the ballot because they do not bear arms, would it not be equally right to exclude that large number of men who are exonerated from military duty?

ELIZABETH A. MERIWETHER.

IX.

MR. EDITOR: If there is one thing in the world more astonishing than another, it is the audacity with which the Roman hierarchy and its controversialists presume upon the ignorance and credulity of the American people. The Pastoral of the Baltimore Council is a conspicuous illustration of this, and Bishop Keane's article in your June number is in keeping therewith. It may suffice to call attention to the paragraph beginning at the foot of page 532 as a

specimen. In this, Bishop Keane insinuates that Mr. Gladstone retracted in 1880 his assertion of 1874 concerning the effect of the action of the Vatican Council on the relation of the citizen to the State. This is a clear *suggestio falsi*. Mr. Gladstone did not in 1874 assert the contrary of his statement of 1880. His utterances on these occasions were entirely consistent. He fully and gladly acknowledged in 1874 that Roman Catholics could and would be "loyal subjects," and he avers now, with even less hesitation than when he published his famous pamphlet on the Vatican decrees, that to be loyal subjects to the State they must disregard or explain away the action of the Vatican Council.

HENRY FORRESTER.

X.

MR. EDITOR: Prof. West has overlooked one fact which invalidates his arguments. It seems not to have occurred to him that elective studies may be disciplinary. He bases his arguments on the assumption that discipline is lost because freedom is gained. This has never been shown to be true. Suppose that in the elective system a student chooses Latin and Greek. Are they any the less valuable because they are not prescribed? But Prof. West would probably say that the choice of anything except the classics does not afford discipline. If this is true, Prof. West's position is invincible. But much more reasonable appears to me the belief that the best culture is reached by following the student's natural aptitudes and inclinations—a belief held by educators so different in their studies as Prof. Huxley and Matthew Arnold. Prof. West would doubtless scout the idea that his article is liable to injure the cause of the classics; yet such I believe to be the case. Speaking of the change, he says, "By making Latin and Greek optional for the boy who is to enter, it puts a premium on the avoidance of these studies which the best experience of the world assures us are the very essentials of high preparation." If it is true, as these words indicate, that in comparison with other studies the classics are distasteful to students, the supporters of the classics have lost their strongest argument. If students are so anxious to leave the study of the classics, then the classics are not the best disciplinary study. A knowledge of human nature and experience in higher education will convince one that in distasteful studies the work is most apt to be superficial, and that the best students are those that have a deep interest in their studies. Making the classics optional does not put a premium on their avoidance, but it keeps as students of the classics those that will be most benefited by their study, and gives to other branches those to whom other branches will be more profitable. Such is the working of the elective system in the University of Michigan. There, two of the three studies, Greek, Latin, and mathematics, are required for two years, and the other for one year. Do students avoid Greek and Latin after they have finished their required work? Not at all. New elective courses in the classics are introduced nearly every year, and are well filled with students. Both the classics and other optional studies are more valuable as discipline, for students take them with a desire and determination to be thorough. The new departure is to be praised because it recognizes that different minds have different requirements, and that the common basis of culture exists not in the matter studied, but in the method of study.

F. B. WIXSON.